Title: > Raised a discussion on the statement made by the Prime Minister on the 15th December, 1998 on bilateral talks with United States.>

15.37 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, as discussed with the leaders of the various parties, item No.25 will be taken up later...(Interruptions).

श्री कड़िया मुण्डा (खूंटी) : आइटम नम्बर २५ को क्यों नहीं लिया जा रहा है ... (व्यवधान) आज इस बिल को नहीं लेने का क्या कारण है ... (व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: Now the Chair wants to take the sense of the House. At four o'clock, we have to take up discussion under Rule 193 on External Affairs. If the House agrees, we shall take up that discussion now itself.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister, in his statement on bilateral talks with U.S., has referred to the major issues...(Interruptions).

श्री थावरचन्द गहलोत (शाजापुर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

श्री थावरचन्द गहलोत : नियम ३७६ के तहत मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि आज की कार्यसूची में मद ३१ में अनुसूचित जाति और जनजाति आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर चर्चा कराने की बात है। अभी जो विषय लिया जा रहा है, वह सबसे आखिर में है और इसके बारे में लिखा है कि अपराहन ४ बजे अथवा कार्यसूची की पूर्व वर्ती मदों के निपटान के तुरन्त बाद, जो भी पहले हो, लिया जाएगा। कार्यसूची की ३१वीं मद अभी बाकी है। १९८१-१९९१ की सात-आठ साल पहले की अनुसूचित जाति और जनजाति की रिपोर्ट है, उस पर चर्चा होनी है, अगर यह नहीं हुई तो अनुसूचित जाति और जनजाति के लोगों के साथ अन्याय होगा।

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, please understand that there is a request from the Minister with regard to the discussion on External Affairs. I have taken the sense of the House also. So, please understand. There is no point of order.

श्री कड़िया मुंडा : मेरा भी व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

श्री रूपचन्द पाल : इतने पाइंट आफ आर्डर में हमारा तो डिसआर्डर हो जाएगा।

Sir, the Prime minister has mentioned the major issues being discussed in the several rounds of talks. This Parliament has been kept in the dark about the talks that have been going on during those several rounds of talks.

1540 hours (Shri Raghuvansh Prasad Singh in the Chair)

Sir, the nation has been eager to know about the discussions because there have been reports that in the discussion itself, India has been gradually surrendering to the pressure being mounted by the American representative and other interlocutors.

India's nuclear policy, as a part of its foreign policy in the pre-Pokhran period, had been one where there was a national consensus, but in

the post-Pokhran scenario, we had stated that this misadventure would make India more vulnerable to pressures, particularly of the US and the exclusive nuclear club, and cause isolation of India.

During the last few months, our apprehensions have proved to be correct. It has been said that there has been some progress during the talks that are taking place till today. The hon. Minister of External Affairs himself has been engaged in the deliberations and can confirm whether the talks were of six rounds or seven rounds. I am saying this because there is a reference to six rounds of talks in the statement, but we know that there was another talk held in Rome on 19th November.

During the seventh round of talks, the American side had exposed their cards. On 12th of November, President Bill Clinton, in a notification, had suggested that not only India should sign CTBT, but India should also join the NPT. On the question of deployment, it was mentioned that India would never be allowed deployment of nuclear weapons. As a follow-up of that notification of 12th of November, the American representative, Strobe Talbott, who had been engaged in the deliberations, in one article in The Times of India and also prior to that in a speech in the Brooking's Institution, had made clear that India should not only sign CTBT but also put a cap on the fissile material and join Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty and then, desist from deployment of delivery system and nuclear weaponisation.

Till this was revealed by the American representative, this nation was kept in the dark. Although Pakistan had also been engaged in a similar dialogue, yet they made everything transparent as to what was going on, what the areas of the dialogue were, where there was an agreement, and where there was no agreement.

Unfortunately, Sir, whenever we had asked this question, we were told that these were `secret talks'. But the veil was lifted by the American Representative himself and that too through an article in an Indian national daily. Openly, she has put forward the American conditions.

After the Pokhran-II tests, in reply to a question, on the 4th of June, it was said that, "After the nuclear tests on 11th and 13th May, 1998 at Pokhran, Government have signalled their willingness to consider adhering to some of the undertakings of CTBT, but not in a political vacuum and depending upon reciprocal responses." This was the same statement made by Shri Brajesh Mishra, immediately after the blasts; this was the position taken by Shri Pramod Mahajan on behalf of the PMO. What is this `reciprocal response'?

During the seven rounds of talks, what was the response of the American side? The Prime Minister reiterated the Indian position that we are committed to our goal of total disarmament and a nuclear weapons free world. Have they agreed to it? Our experience is that, till today, whatever and wherever discussions have taken place about disarmament, that they have not agreed to that. They wanted to form an exclusive nuclear club and they have now extended NPT also.

On CTBT, the Americans had great reservations. But at a point of time, they revised their position and in the latest version of CTBT, they included certain things conforming to their interest allowing vertical proliferation, sub-critical tests, computer simulation and so on. At least, three American laboratories are very near to producing pure fusion weapon systems. They are outside this CTBT. They are interpreting things in their own way. In their superb national interest, they are going on experimenting weapons of mass destruction, of a very sophisticated and refined type, in their laboratories and they will never need underground tests because they have done a lot. By this time, more than 2,000 such experiments have taken place and, at least, a little more than half have been done by the Americans themselves.

Sir, we have been putting our arguments, our nuclear doctrine, our no-first-use concept, that we shall not use nuclear weapons on non-nuclear powers, and we have spoken about credible minimum nuclear deterrence. What is their response? What does this concept of credible minimum nuclear deterrence mean?

It is not my question only; it is not the question of Parliament only, it is the same question asked by the American representative through several dialogues. The Americans do have their own concept of deterrence. In a book, it has been stated clearly by the American expert that they do not have any faith in what is being projected from the Indian side as minimum nuclear deterrent, credible deterrent. What does it mean? Weaponisation. After the blast, the Government has to go for weaponisation. We have great objection to it. This

nation, the scientists and others have serious objections to it. They say that this misadventure will land the whole nation in serious difficulty.

Now, in the post 12th November situation, things are coming -- no missile, however bravado we may be in our statement. The crux of the problem is that they are tightening their screws one by one. If there is any result, it is that the screws have been tightened. There is no reference to it in the statement. The Brookings Institute's speech, the Times of India article and the American President's notification about the entities list consisting of 200 Indian Private Public Sector companies which came just four days before the Rome dialogue. What are these companies? There are even food-processing units in the entities list. Larson and Toubro who had done something for the Nuclear Power Corporation five years back and Godrej and Boyce company who had the tool rooms engaged in the civilian production only are also in the list. They had nothing to do with nuclear research or anything like that. But what has happened to them? Has there been any objection even in the midst of the deliberations? It has not happened. We are succumbing to their own position to which they are sticking.

In the Statement, there are four major issues that have been discussed and mentioned by the hon. Prime Minister. One of them is the CTBT. We know our position with regard to the CTBT. In 1996, when it came, the Indian representative had opposed the CTBT on the ground that it had no commitment to total disarmament which is our goal and commitment, and which we have been pursuing for the last five decades since the days of Pandit Nehru. Even when we acceded to this CTBT, we had hoped that step by step, it would lead to disarmament, total elimination of the weapons of mass destruction. Even when Rajiv Gandhi had placed his historic formula of a time-bound programme, what was the reaction? Be it America or for that matter the Nuclear Club, they want to perpetuate their monopoly in a different language, at a different level by allowing them the scope and opportunity for vertical proliferation while denying others, the developing countries. The developing countries have agreed but the three threshold countries countries, India, Pakistan and Israel are the targets of CTBT.

The whole history of American diplomacy with regard to Pakistan shows that particularly in the current scenario, in their geo-political strategy, Pakistan is important. It will give them access to the CIS countries to control Oil of these areas. You find that even the Talibans of Afganistan are not being criticised. They are soft to Pakistan. However, they may try to show a semblance of equity. Even in the last sanctions which were lifted, what do you find? You will find that it is selective and partial and it is against us. Maybe, we are also interested that Pakistan's economy should be saved and that Indians and Pakistanis should have friendly relations which should grow. We want better relations with friendly countries like Pakistan, Bangladesh and China which were developed and strengthened during the United Front Government's time. But the American game plan is to put India and Pakistan first at the same level and at par with it and then to pursue their game plan. These dialogues are being held simultaneously. It has a meaning that they are discussing with India and also alternatively with Pakistan. They are putting pressure on both India and Pakistan to sign CTBT and we are talking of credible minimum nuclear deterrents. Whatever it may be, I am not going into the details. I will come to that later. Will these credible minimum deterrents be not allowed to Pakistan also? With their concept of difference, shall we not go a step further? If we go a step further, will it not lead to arms race? In this sub-continent, we have committed ourselves to deterrane and ironically we are contributing ourselves to arms race. Leave aside the question of cost factor. How much is required? According to a calculation, this weaponisation will require not less than Rs.50,000 crore in the first lap only. It may be a conservative estimate. Their game plan is they will compel us, pressurise us, to push us through CTBT and, at the same time, whatever we consider about the weaponisation programme, they will stay at the top to supervise and monitor. Under American monitoring and American supervisorship, India and Pakistan will play with these two toys. Wherever required, they will pull it and stop it. Otherwise, it may be said that it is categorically speltout in the Brooking.Institution Speechs of Mr. Strobe Talbot.It is not CTBT or NPT only.Us want India to join NPT.

They want that India should restrain from deployment also . We have been told that India stop fissile material production and put a cap on it. They are asking us to join the MTCR. They are asking us to join in the name of export control regime with nuclear Suppliers Group. I would like to mention here that a few weeks ago the American experts came, the Pentagon people. The officials of the State Department of the Ministry of Commerce and Government of United States had discussionswith India. But this Parliament has been kept in the dark on this visit of American experts.

16.00 hrs.

Parliament was never informed how American experts had come for examining our Export Control Regime. This is very unfortunate.

There are American nuclear ships in Diego Garcia. When it was raised, the hon. Minister of Defence said that he had no knowledge about it. He has no knowledge about the American nuclear presence in Diego Garcia.

Incidentally, let me remind - and I hope the Government will reply to this point - that there has been partial lifting of sanctions. It is just a token, symbolic lifting of sanctions. Do you know the areas in which sanctions have been lifted? It is joint military education and training between the American Defense Department and the Indian Ministry of Defence. This is one of the areas where sanctions have been lifted. If we want to borrow some money from the IMF to face a certain situation in our economy, India is not allowed but Pakistan is allowed to do that.

I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of External Affairs, himself a very knowledgeable man who had been present in all these discussions and interlocutions, whether any country - be it the USA, the UK or France or any other country - belonging to the P-5 or, for that matter, the G-7 has accepted the Indian position as a nuclear weapon State. This is a specific question. Has any country recognized India till today as a nuclear weapons country? I may say that, you may say that and the Government may also say that India is a nuclear weapons State but no country has said it. They have ridiculed us and asked us to join the NPT as a non-nuclear nation. The cut-off period of 1st January, 1967 is well known.

There is a willingness to join the CTBT. Has it ceased to be discriminatory? Has CTBT added any commitment to our disarmament goal? Will it serve our security concerns?

I would like the Government to respond to the point on the Rome deliberations. Prior to the Rome deliberations, pressure was mounted through the entities list. I would like to know whether this question was raised in the meetings. What was the response? The response was arrogance. The response was: `I have told your people but you have not told them that we are imposing conditions and that you are agreeing, complying or surrendering to our position one-by-one'. This is the tone and tenor of the speech and also of the article in The Times of India.

I am told that a question was raised in the deliberations about this new element. I am referring to the 19th November meeting. This was about delivery systems, deployment, missiles and all the other things. Are they new elements at all? If you look at the whole history of the US approach to Indian position, it is nothing new.

The Government should have known it. But still they are so enamoured of the nuclear programme for small political gains. They entrapped the whole nation and made this nation vulnerable. How come such a pressure is possible now which was not possible earlier? It is because we are isolated. In the comity of nations, our distant neighbours, the countries belonging to the Non-Aligned Movement had faith in us and they believed in our leadership. They cannot believe us any more. We have lost that high pedestal or moral authority to tell them or to give them the leadership. If the nation is to be saved, we shall have to regain that position. For regaining that position, two things are there. If the Government fails, this message should go from the Parliament that this country will not sign the CTBT and that this country will not go in for weaponisation. This will make us regain our position. Instead, what are we doing?

During the period of the United Front's Government, the relations with Pakistan, the relations with China and the relations with many other neighbours were strengthened. Suddenly we find after the blasts that our Prime Minister is writing a letter to the US President saying that China is our main enemy. How suddenly, overnight, such a discovery could be made? Some of the responsible or irresponsible partners of this Government and also some important leaders made things worse and caused us isolation and as a result of that isolation, there is this mounting pressure.

I will conclude my speech within ten or fifteen minutes. I am initiating this. On the points that I make, there will be many discussions.

सभापति महोदय : कृपया अब समाप्त करें। समय की सीमा है। अनलिमिटेड टाइम नहीं दिया जा सकता है। इस पर अन्य सदस्य भी बोलना चाहते हैं। अतः कृपया अब कन्क्लूड करें।

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : No. I am not going to do that. I would not take much time. I am concluding.

Now, one idea is being sold, but there is no buyer. What is that? They are talking of quid pro quo -- we shall sign the CTBT, provided we are given high technology or dual use technology and the sanctions are lifted. What was the response of the US Government? It was a big `no', in a language to which they are used to. But still we are speaking about dual use technology and about all other things.

Both India and Pakistan now have been put at par by the US; and through the deliberations, they are gradually cornering us. Now, it has come to such a situation because of the entry clause of the CTBT which we had opposed. There are threshold three countries as I told earlier. Leave aside Israel; Pakistan will ultimately fall in line with US geostrategic plan. So, India is the button in the whole gameplan; US want push it and if India agrees, other countries will follow suit. Till today out of the 78 countries that had signed CTBT, how many had ratified? But we are in a hurry to sign it. Day in and day out, we are expressing our willingness to sign it. It has been mentioned in the P.M's statement itself that it is not to be delayed beyond September 1999 and endeavours are to be made to take it to a successful conclusion through discussions. Only ten countries have done it and out of them only two P-5 countries, that is, the UK and France have ratified CTBT.

France has its own interpretation of CTBT. Russia has not done it; and China has not done it. Out of the 54 countries, including India, only ten countries had done it. Why are you in a hurry? What is the compulsion? The Americans know that once they push through their agenda through India, others will follow suit and that they can manage things with Russia and China at different level. What happened to the ratification of the US itself? I have a lot of materials to show as to what is the reaction of the Republican Senator Mr. Helms who heads the Committee on External Affairs. Will they be able to pass it as easily as it is made out to be?

Unfortunately, India had not condemned the recent attack on Iraq by the US and the UK. The Government only deplored it. Russia, despite all its problems, condemned it; China condemned it; and even some smaller countries condemned it. The opinion of the American people and the world has made them to stop bombing. We failed to criticise America when it was bombing Sudan and Afghanistan.

What would happen to this ratification? No one knows. But we are in a hurry. From the speeches of the former Finance Minister, it seems to me that the Congress Party has taken a position of `wait and watch till September, 1999'. But our position is very clear. We have categorically stated not to sign the CTBT. It is mortgaging the sovereignty of the nation, and our independence. Do not go for weaponisation. Then only will we be able to get back to our independent position. There are hundreds of others who would rally round us to oppose the new world order. The desire of the US and some of its allies is to bring about a change in the scheme of things by subverting our independence.

As far as the fissile material is concerned, our country will not be allowed to have even fifty per cent of the lowest stock of any of the P5 countries. What about our missile programme? The hon. Prime Minister is speaking about national consensus on this. He has convened a meeting of the leaders belonging to many political parties. National consensus on what? On the issue of surrender of our independent position! Through the misadventure of Pokhran, the Government has made our position vulnerable. That is being used by the US and other countries to mount pressure on us to submit to their gameplan. They want to have authority even to supervise our nuclear programmes and our defence postures. This did not happen during the regime of the United Front Government. I was reading a letter written by the former Prime Minister. Even during 1996 the question of CTBT did come up. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was consulted; and Shri Chandra Shekhar was consulted. But this time you want national consensus to extricate yourself from the serious difficulty in which you have landed yourself.

The national consensus had been there. It is the BJP led Government that has destroyed it. A National Policy was there. If this national consensus is to be brought back, it can be done. I would suggest, do not fall victim to

the US game plan, extricate yourself from the trap, do not weaponize and do not sign CTBT. By this, we shall regain our position and people from whom we have isolated, will have new faith on us.

Lastly, in the Statement, the Prime Minister has said a lot about the bilateral dialogue. But, there had been dialogue with France, UK and with many more countries. Their representatives had come and it has been referred towards the end but no mention has been made about the response of our position, whether they appreciate or stick to the position? What is the position of the South African Government? How Mr. Nelson Mandela takes it? How the developing countries who have faith in us, who have accepted our leadership, who are friendly with us, with whom we have long age old friendship, look at it? There is no mention of what their response is.

सभापति महोदय : अब समाप्त किया जाये।

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I would conclude by saying that the BJP in its enthusiasm, or should I say jingoism, has landed the country in serious difficulties and it is the duty of the Parliament to save the nation. Even if the Government has failed to send the correct message to the American Government and their allies and say that we would not sign CTBT, we shall not go for weaponisation, then the Parliament has a right to send such a message.

>SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for the opportunity given to me. It is history that our country gave a clarion call in fifties to end all nuclear weapons testing. Today, our hon. Prime Minister has categorically, in no uncertain terms, reiterated our undiluted commitment to global disarmament. He has reiterated our commitment to world peace; he has reiterated our commitment to see that all the weapons of mass destruction be eliminated.

I may be permitted to invite the attention of my hon. colleagues that late lamented Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of our foreign policy, stated on 2nd April on the floor of this House that nuclear, chemical and biological power and energy shall not be used to forge weapons of mass destruction. So, again in the year 1965, it was our country which formulated along with some Non-Aligned countries that the world should adopt a Non-Proliferation Agreement so that the nuclear weapon States should get rid of the nuclear arsenal.

The situation changed. Our security concerns deepened, the security environment took a total change and in the year 1968 the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi, former Prime Minister asserted on April 5th, 1968 on the floor of this House that we shall entirely be guided by our enlightenment and the considerations of national security. Yes, of course, in the year 1988, the then Congress Government tried its best in the United Nations to bring a comprehensive formula to eliminated nuclear arsenal from the face of the earth. But Sir, Shri Rupchand Pal who moved this discussion made an accusation that the country now headed by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has surrendered its sovereign rights to the pressure of United States.

But we should not forget the fact fact that it is in the year 1962 that we had to face the bitterest betrayal from China when we were stabbed behind our back. Right from that day, another neighbour with whom we have fought three wars, had been continuously getting nuclear technology, the nuclear missiles posing a security threat.

The Standing Committee in which Members from all political parties, cutting across party lines, participated, came to the conclusion that China was a primary security challenge to India. I put it the other way. Under these circumstances, in order to safeguard the territorial integrity and sovereignty of this great country India, to protect the sovereignty against any use of force or against any threat to use force, we had to adopt the posture of nuclear deterrence. The words have been very carefully coined - `minimum nuclear deterrence', the `credible minimum nuclear deterrence'. Under these circumstances, when the so-called five powers, the self-proclaimed monopolists of the nuclear umbrella, were building up the abominable edifice of nuclear apartheid, it is our country that had taken a step to demolish that edifice.

My friend was telling that nobody had admitted that India is a nuclear State. Whether anybody admits or not, whether the United States admits or not, whether Russia, China, UK or France admit or not, you call by any

name, rose is rose. India today is a nuclear State. That is a fact; that is a reality. When we conducted the Pokhran tests on 11th May and 13th May, a hue and cry was raised. Sanctions were imposed because they wanted to perpetuate the nuclear apartheid policy of preaching sermons by saying, "You should not go for production of nuclear weapons. You should not go for conducting nuclear explosion." These countries have conducted more than 2000 nuclear tests.

India has taken the earnest step. That is why, it was called the defining moment in the history of this country. History will salute the decision taken by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. My friends from the Congress benches may have difference of opinion, they may have other political differences, but on the issue of CTBT, the Government had taken them into confidence and the consensus build up is going on. As we have debated on the floor of this House, the issue of CTBT was debated and a consensus decision was arrived at, that we should not sign the CTBT.

Of course, in the initial stages, both the Treaties - the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty - were unequal, discriminatory, not comprehensive and not universal. But at one point of time, we also extended our cooperative hand for the CTBT. What happened? Article 14 of the CTBT was targeted against India. 319 monitoring stations will be located in India. Then, when they found it difficult to get us into their trap, they altered the Article. So, Article 14 was altered and the entry into force was made conditional on the ratification of the 44 countries. It is very important. I would like to emphasise this point. The entry into force was made conditional on the ratification of the 44 countries.

MR. CHAIRMAN :Please conclude.

SHRI VAIKO : Sir, from the Government side, I am the first speaker. I have not yet started my speech. I have to meet the criticism point by point because many charges have been levelled against the Government. It is a very serious matter. It is a very important discussion. In the whole Session, this is going to be the important discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be brief and try to conclude.

SHRI VAIKO : There is no question of dirty politics in this. I am putting it in brief only. Otherwise, it will take hours.

Coming to my point, Mr. Chairman, when the CTBT was altered, it was made conditional. On the ratification of the 44 countries which have been designated by the International Atomic Energy Agency, it was made conditional. That is totally against the concept of the Vienna Convention. We were forced and we were compelled to subjugate ourselves to become a signatory to the CTBT. But the Government of India did not budge. What happened? Then, the matter was taken to the United Nations General Assembly. Australia moved a resolution to adopt the non-consensus Draft Treaty for which 158 countries voted in favour. India, Bhutan and Libya opposed that resolution. Cuba, Lebanon, Tanzania, Syria and Mauritius abstained when the voting took place. It was asked that how many countries have ratified it. Shri Rupchand Pal raised this question. Of course, only ten countries have ratified it. In the United States, the CTBT would be signed by the President. That is their system. The President has to sign the CTBT. Then, it will go to the Senate for ratification. It is a paradox. The impeachment motion is also going to the Senate for ratification. The United States, at any time, will ratify it. Some other countries, the so-called monopolists of the nuclear umbrella will also ratify it.

I would commend the decision of this Government. The desire of the international community is that the CTBT should come into effect in September, 1999. That is the wish of the international community. We cannot stand in isolation. The situation is totally different from 1996; the situation is different when it was debated on the floor of this House in 1996. So, a new situation has arisen and the new situation warrants appropriate decision. Our hon. Prime Minister on 24th September, when addressed the United Nations General Assembly, reiterated the stand taken on the floor of this Parliament. Hon. Prime Minister in his address stated:

"India is now engaged in discussions with our key interlocutors on a range of issues including the CTBT. We are prepared to bring these discussions to a successful conclusion so that the entry into force of the CTBT is not

delayed beyond September, 1999. We expect that other countries, as indicated in Article XIV of the CTBT, will adhere to this treaty without condition."

May I ask a question to our hon. friends? Where are we surrendering the sovereign rights? Very carefully we have coined the words "the desire of the international community is that the CTBT should come into effect in September, 1999." Entry into force of the CTBT is not delayed beyond September, 1999. We expect that other countries, as indicated in Article XIV of the CTBT, will adhere to this treaty without condition. We have not made any compromise; we have not made any commitment. At the same time, we should not forget the fact that the condition is that it should be ratified by 44 countries designated by the International Atomic Energy Agency. May I put a question? What will happen if India is left out and suppose if other 43 countries have put their signatures? Yes, at the same time, we have to protect our sovereignty. We may not bother about the sanctions imposed by the U.S.A. and other countries, but we should look from this angle. There may be sanctions; there may be impediments; there may be obstacles from the international community in so many forms. We are not going to lose anything. Had we signed the CTBT, we could not have gone in for conducting the Pokhran tests.

In the year 1987 itself, Pakistan was boasting of possessing nuclear weapons. ... (Interruptions) From the Government side, I am the first speaker, Mr. Chairman. Kindly permit me to continue my speech. I crave your indulgence.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude in two minutes.

SHRI VAIKO: I have two or three important points. I have to meet some of the criticisms levelled by my friend. ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a long list of hon. Members.

SHRI VAIKO : India has taken the commendable decision by conducting the Pokhran tests. Today, protecting the supreme national interest, security interest is very much there. Even Article IX of the CTBT clearly establishes the fact that this treaty shall be of unlimited duration. Each State body shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this treaty, if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty have jeopardised its supreme interest. That option is there for every country. The tests on 11th and 13th May have produced critical data for the validation of our capability in the design of nuclear weapons of different yields for different applications.

The scientists Dr. Abdul Kalam and Dr. Chidambaram, for whom the whole country owes its gratitude, have stated:

"We have complete mastery over a range of nuclear weapon technologies and they are intended for different delivery systems. Also, we can do computer simulation of subcritical experiments in the future."

These are taking place in the world today.

Sir, Dr. P.K. Iyengar, the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who was closely associated with the May, 1974 peaceful nuclear explosion at Pokhran when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was at the helm of affairs, has stated:

"India must also look to the future. Pursuit of more sophisticated nuclear devices for weapons is a part of the continuing research in national weapons laboratories.

Laboratories around the world are working on these and other paths towards producing fourth-generation nuclear weapons. One important feature of these fourth-generation weapons will be that they will not use uranium or plutonium, and therefore will not come under the purview of the NPT or the CTBT. This is a matter of enormous political significance, and India should seriously pursue research in these areas. These researches could lead to new concepts in the controlled release of fusion energy."

Now, we are competent to do that. We are competent to go in for subcritical experiments which the other nuclear weapon countries are doing.

Sir, regarding our research and development programme, the Prime Minister, in his statement, has clearly stated that it does not constrain us from continuing with our research and development programmes, nor does it jeopardise in any manner the safety and effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent in the years to come. Therefore, India will not accept any restraint on the research and development capabilities.

As far as the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty is concerned, I would like to say that India is a signatory of non-discriminatory treaties, like the Chemical Weapons Convention or the Biological Weapons Convention. But the treaty should be non-discriminatory, universal and comprehensive. We have

expressed our willingness to arrive at a non-discriminatory treaty that will end the future production of fissile material for the purpose of weapons in accordance with the 1993 consensus resolution of the UN General Assembly.

Sir, my friends were telling that the US pressures have yielded results. Where is the pressure? Where have we succumbed to their pressure? The Prime Minister, in his statement, has stated that it was suggested to us that we might examine announcing a moratorium on fissile material production. But our Government have clearly conveyed that it is not possible to take such steps at this stage and the effect of the FMCT cannot be retrospective. We have clearly stated that it can be prospective and it cannot be retrospective.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI VAIKO : Sir, I am concluding. Kindly allow me a few minutes more. A lot of time is swallowed on so many debates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are so many speakers.

SHRI VAIKO : It is an important discussion and we are going to sit late in the night also. Kindly allow me some more time.

As far as export controls over sensitive materials and technology are concerned, we are taking steps to make our laws more stringent in this regard. Likewise, we have clearly stated that the CTBT cannot be linked with the question of Kashmir. We have also stated that there is no question of third party mediation with regard to Kashmir issue and that the Kashmir issue is not negotiable at any cost.

Sir, under the stewardship of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Government took the right decision to conduct the grand tests and the future history is going to tell that. Today, we are in a better position even with regard to CTBT. We are in a safer position. We can go in for subcritical tests. We are at par with those so-called monopolists of nuclear umbrella.

And with pride, we are insisting that the whole world should be kept rid of these weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, when the hue and cry was raised from the United States, our hon. Prime Minister designated the competent person with all capability and merit, Shri Jaswant Singh. He deputed Shri Jaswant Singh and he has done his job wonderfully well. There are six rounds of talks. We have never yielded. We have never compromised. We have safeguarded the interests of this country. We have safeguarded the supreme interest, that is, the security interest. That is why they have coined the words `nuclear deterrent'. Therefore, the history of this country, the decision taken by this Government and also the steps taken so far in this regard will be commended. I commend all the steps taken by the Government and also the talks which Shri Jaswant Singh had held who was deputed by the Prime Minister. He had done a valuable and creditable job.

With these words, I commend the efforts made by the Government. I also appeal to my friends on that side. It is not a partisan issue. It is not a political issue. It is an issue to protect the interests and future of the country.

Therefore, I would like to make an appeal on this particuar issue. The consensus-building is going in. I expect cooperation from these Benches.

>SHRI I.K. GUJRAL (JALANDHAR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must say that the discussion today acquires a much wider dimension with the two statements made by the Prime Minister. I say `much wider' because since the two statements were made, a few more things have happened. But I think, before I come to these incidents and their history I must begin by complimenting Shri Jaswant Singh first.

I am glad that he has been given this portfolio at this very crucial moment. Not only do I wish to congratulate him because he is a personal friend and also a Member of long-standing in the two Houses of the Parliament, he has given an evidence of his remarkable intellect and also his Parliamentary style and articulation. I wish him well.

I said just now that it is unusual that a personality like Shri Jaswant Singh, even before he takes charge of the Foreign Office, was really working as Minister of Foreign Affairs. I think, that was a good decision because going by the record of his articulation and by his interlocutions with the Americans, I think, he has given an evidence of the fact that he deserves to be placed where he has been placed. My good wishes to you, Shri Jaswant Singh.

I said a while ago that the two statements that the Prime Minister had made recently are in the background of the situation that is happening in our region, in Asia and the world as a whole. Every day, we see a new chapter turned. And one of the happening last week itself, that is, the Baghdad bombing by the power which assigns to itself the role of a policeman of the world. I have no objection to their being policemen provided the policeman discharges a responsibility in the way it is supposed to.

It is not only of interest to note that it also causes concern that while the United Nations sees and feels that the most important member of the Security council, a permanent member, a member that enjoys the power of Veto decides to bypass the Security Council, decides to overlook the fact that whatever sanctions the United Nations imposed on Iraq, nearly a decade ago, were on the order of the United Nations and not on the order of an individual country or two countries.

When these two countries, as I said just now, proceed to fracture the structure of the United Nations this House has to feel cencered see because we in India from the day one the United Nations was perceived, have taken a great deal of interest in it. Since the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, there was hardly a moment in the world history when the world was called upon to do something that India did not respond. There is no incident in the world history that I can recall in the last fifty years, be it Korea or Indo-China and I could go on counting endlessly, when India was as a responsible member of the United Nations expected to play a role, it did come up and played a role. That is why, if some times we feel that a seat or two in the Security Council are vacated, we feel that it requires reformulation and it requires redefinition. We feel in the broader interest it is important for us to see a note and realise that any weakening of the United Nations is not in our interest. Its weakening is not in the interest of the world peace as a whole.

1652 hours (Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

It is an unfortunate fact that last week's incidents do weaken the faith in the United Nations itself, not caused by the United Nations' structure, the bureaucracy, the Secretary-General or anybody but by those who were really supposed to play a more responsible role.

Much has been said to criticise what America has done and what the UK has done. I will not repeat that. I think, both the Prime Minister's Statement here and the discussion in the other House have brought this point home. I will only say that the more concern causing is, apart from the fact that Iraq has been damaged, it is more important for us to sit up and see what is the future of the United Nations itself.

For quite some time, both here and outside all parties in the House whether in power or on this side of the House, we have been wanting some sort of a reform in the United Nations. I think, if ever it was urgent, its

urgency is now more because we feel that the United Nations' leadership is not safe in the hands of those who are supposed to lead it.

I would also say it is a very new scenario opening before us. The United States has their bases in some Arab countries also. Those of us, who have been keeping an eye on what is happening the world over see that the largest base in Middle-East was in Saudi Arabia. But, when this hour came, the Americans could not dare to fly their planes from Saudi Arabia. Those bases could not be used because they knew that the sentiments of the Arabs in this context are totally out of step with what they were trying to do.

I was, last week, in the UAE and saw for myself in my discussions with the Defence Minister and others, the situation that they were apprehending. It is not that they knew that this was coming but the sentiment, the emotion, the outlook was very visible. And that visibility also is glittering when we see the UAE bases could also not being used.

Therefore, I feel and I think, the Prime Minister's Statement has been correct and I support it. We all think that it is a matter of great concern for all of us in India particularly, because whenever we think in terms of the weapon placings in the bases the `gunboat diplomacy' coming back to our mind. We in India and I think, all of us in South-Asia feel concerned about it.

It means that the day can come, God forbid it should not, but if it does come that India does not bend before the will of a power, then this type of 16th, 17th, 18th Century gun boat diplomacy can be revived. I have said here and I repeat, this act isa very reprehensible act and I do hope that this will be the end of such irresponsibility and arrogance of power.

It was a happy coincidence that, at this moment, the Prime Minister of Russia was visiting India. I am sure that in the coming days, the Minister of External Affairs and the hon. Prime Minister will take this House in confidence and tell us something more than what the media has said.

India-Russia relationships are the relationships of long standing. This House and the country one of the items on which great deal of consensus touching is unity exists regarding friendship with Russia. It is a fine friendship which has stood the test of time, it is a friendship which has been very useful to both sides on difficult moments. Therefore, when Mr. Primakov came here and talked to the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues here, I am sure, more areas must have been discovered for added cooperation. Whatever one has read in the media encourages this feeling. It also makes one feel that although there is a moment of not strength for Russia, we are talking in terms of close friendship, we are talking in terms of strategic partnership, we are talking in terms of declaration that was to be signed. President Yeltsin could not come, but when he comes, it will be signed.

The newspapers have also said that there was a casual remark by Mr. Primakov about cooperation between India, China and Russia. I am glad that it has been corrected. We are wanting to have good relations with China. That has been our policy for quite some time. I think, it is in the interest of both China and India to have good and friendly relations. But I do not think and I think and rightly so, the Prime Minister and Mr. Primakov have clarified that this is not the era of camp formations. We do not want to form any camp between three of us, but that does not also mean that three of us cannot be and need not be good close friends. The world economic order is such that neighbours have to cooperate. The world is moving in a direction where neighbourhood friendship is of great deal of significance and importance.

Very often and some people have been saying whether somebody is trying to play a China card or not. I think not now, but even when I sat on the Treasury Benches, I had clarified and I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister of India also has said the same thing that India has no intention of playing any such card against any other country. We want to have very good relations with America, but even more important is our relations with neighbours in South Asia. For some time now, we have been contributing our might to also possible. I see and encourage from the fact that although in the month of May tests were performed both in India and Pakistan, the discussions and the talks between India and Pakistan have been very encouraging. Who could have imagined that three months after such tests and acrimony, we could think in terms of starting a bus service from Delhi to

Lahore and vice versa, who could ever think that three months after this, we would go to Pakistan and buy about one million tonnes of sugar. It is very interesting.

Some Pakistani friends were talking to me last week. I said that the compulsions of economy are very interesting. Whenever we talk in terms of the free trade zone in this area, Pakistan always apprehended that India would swamp its economy.

It was also apprehended that our industrialists would go there and really take over the weaker economy of Pakistan. And now when I hear that some Indian sugar interests getting hold of my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Food, asking them to impose some restrictions on that -- I am not commenting on the merits and demerits of it -- but I think they will not succumb to it. Opening markets is in India's interests both ways and wherever we are opening markets we must keep in mind the fact that at some point or the other, one side or the other will always be pinched. Therefore, all such pinches should not decide our policies. Broader vision of what we have been trying to say of South Asian region, open market, free market era is ultimately will the salvation of our problems, both political and economic.

I do feel that this is a matter for which we can derive great deal of satisfaction that the policies that we have been following by various Governments, by the Treasury Benches, various parties who ran them, the continuity of their policy have been sustained and for this also I draw a great deal of satisfaction and when I say this I mean my colleague Shri Jaswant Singh.

Relationships with America are of importance. Even when momentarily we feel sometimes the difficulties have been created, we do feel at the same time, that what has happened in West Asia should not have happened. Sometimes we feel that the responsible powers should behave differently but I think, I suggest and I commend this should not stand in the way of improving our relations with America.

The talks that have been going on between Mr. Talbott and Shri Jaswant Singh had some recourse and justifiably because I do feel that those who were negotiating with Shri Jaswant Singh should have been more responsible. Because the type of Press Conference that was given or the statement that was made or the speech that was made, gave a very different message than what Shri Jaswant

Singh was trying to give and I think this is a message which does not help in building friendship in particular.

One day before the Rome meeting the Times of India carried that long statement, long constructive article and the opening paragraph by itself says that 'we are trying to talk to the Indian people." I talked to one of the diplomats of that country and I asked him what was the purpose in that, was he trying to bypass the Government of India. Was it necessary for him ; to talk to the Indian people and the Indian Parliament over the head of the Government of India, were he under the impression that the Government of India was not telling the truth to the Indian people, that the Government of

India in the name of confidentiality was not telling Parliament what it should have. Otherwise, I could never justify and I think we need not justify the type of article that was sent by under Mr. Talbott's own signature. Even the veil of the relying source was not used. His name has been used.

I have seen Shri Jaswant Singh's statement in the other House. where he has tried to defend him. I think `defend' may not be the correct word. But perhaps trying to provide them an escape route and I think this is something that we must forthright understand that whatever our internal views may be, when it comes to a third country or a second country or outside country we are a phase of India and the Government of India whosoever party may be, enjoys the confidence of the people of India. Therefore, when the talks are going on this must be kept in mind that such methodologies may not impose sufferance on India, may not divide and our voice is raised in a way that united.

I do not want to take your time on the issue of nuclear weapons and nuclear powers. I think the debate has been considerably discussed here and I think the doctrine which Shri Jaswant Singh has been projecting and the Prime Minister has been talking about the minimum deterrent and the argument that he has given in the other House

has really defined as to what it means. I will not ask him to repeat again nor will I try to ask him those questions. But I think one thing has come; which I must note, for we must note by ourselves and that is that the CTBT is a road towards the NPT.

And that is a Lakshman Rekha which we must cross with great deal of care and great deal of certainty, and understand where it will take us. I do hope when ever that stage comes, the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister will take us in confidence. We may be able to suggest some ways and means of meeting the situation.

1705 hours (Shri K. Yerrannaidu in the Chair)

In the beginning, I had mentioned about the economic crisis. The economic crisis is something which all of us have to keep in mind. In the last few months, I have undertaken some travels, particularly, in the East Asian countries. I have been to Japan. I have been to Korea and I have been to Hong Kong. I have given a great deal of attention to study the type of crisis that these countries are facing. In Seoul, last month the UNDP had convened a Conference of 32 nations. The Government of India was represented by its Secretary and the Member of Planning Commission. I had the privilege also that I was invited by the UNDP to address them as a keynote speaker. What was happening there? What do we see there? We see for ourselves a situation which depresses everyone. We see that as the new millennium is coming, there is a great deal of depression all around. For instance, you go to Seoul. You see that a nation, which, in a matter of 20 years became from a developing nation to a developed nation with remarkably large GDP growth and reserves, is overnight impoverished. I saw for myself the entire middle-class of South Korea wiped out in a way that one sees and feels very sad about .

The situation regarding Thailand has been equally upsetting. A few weeks before the crisis so quickly came to Thailand, the organizations like the World Bank and other similar organizations were telling us about the merits of the economy of this country. They were recommending us to follow them. One of the statements made was about the most vibrant economy of the world. I asked a question when I met some of them what happened to them. How did it happen? These organizations which give us the gurumanthra all the time, did not know what was going to happen in Korea. They did not know what was going to happen in Malaysia. When did they discover that the leader of Indonesia was corrupt? When did they discover, for instance, that Malaysia was investing more money than it should have in the real estates? When did they decide and discover? When did IMF know that South Korea was overstepping itself by taking short-term loans? A few weeks before the crisis in South Korea, South Korea was invited in OCED, an elite organization of the developed nations. Then, in a few weeks, you find it crashing in the way I have described you just now. I raised the question with these great pundits of the IMF and the World Bank and asked them here as well as there, what has happened. Why has it happened? You must tell us so that we are able to take care of ourselves. This year alone, for example, the economy of Indonesia will shrink by further 16 per cent. You imagine the impact it has on the people and their lives. You imagine that the economy of Korea will shrink by another six per cent. Therefore, they are still on the negative side. Even if the negative side stops, it takes time. We do not know when it will happen. In this darkness that one sees around, I must compliment the UNDP. The UNDP has taken steps and given a new way of thinking. I do not know how many hon. Members had the opportunity of seeing their annual reports of human development. The human development is being defined now in a different fashion. Up-till now, we were made to believe that the rate of growth only means the GDP.

We were made all the way to believe that if we go on liberalising on the lines that the IMF indicates, the growth will come. You will kindly recall that every time India was told that look at the tigers where they are going, and when the tigers suddenly jump down, nobody tells us what has happened and why it has happened. I was saying that I am giving tribute to UNDP and thanks to one of our fellow South-Asian, Mehboob-ul-Haq, a citizen of Pakistan - unfortunately, he died a few months ago. He was a man of new vision. He re-spelt for us that ultimately development means elimination of illiteracy, elimination of poverty, elimination of those children's circumstances which stand in the way of their going to schools. It also means how much drinking water has been given, how much per capita food has been consumed. I commend to my hon. friends that this report must be seen by some of us. Recently, the UNDP also came out with a report on South Asia Pacific, and all our countries have been examined one by one.

Two or three things come out very pertinently which are of importance to us. It points out that whenever you want to tackle the problem of growth of population, the short and the tested way out is removal of illiteracy, and we have picked it up. They have told us: Look at Kerala, for instance. When the literacy touches about 100 per cent, the growth of population stops. Take particularly the literacy of women. Wherever women have been made literate, be it in Goa, be it in Tamil Nadu, be it now in Karnataka and in Andhra, and more so, in Mizoram, you see a new thing. The second thing that the report brings out is that it does not depend upon the resources. For instance, the per capita income of a Punjab citizen is much higher than in Kerala. But unfortunately and I say it with great deal of regret because I come from that State and my friend Shri Barnala is sitting here - I do not think we can raise our heads with pride because Punjab's average literacy is near about the national average of 50 per cent, and women's literacy is about 26-27 per cent. The report also brings out another interesting thing. It does not depend upon the resources; it also does not depend upon the religious beliefs. In our neighbourhood, there is a country, a small country, a proud country called Maldives. They have 100 per cent Muslims, 100 per cent literacy. Men and women, all are literate. Therefore, when we are making foreign policy today, we cannot possibly divorce our foreign policy from the economic policy because that is what we are told everyday. What drags us in India, unfortunately - and I say it with regret and apology - is our Hindi belt. And I do hope, our friends who get elected by those people, be it Bihar, be it U.P. particularly, will give a great deal of attention to this. On the same writings, same way of thinking, another Indian, of whom we can be proud, Amartya Sen, has been given Nobel Prize. This Nobel Prize has been given because Amartya Sen's thinking is that he has devoted his life to argue that there is no more to economic growth and change than merely economic statistics at the macro levels. I take this opportunity, therefore, to pay my tributes to these two great stalwarts of South Asia, Mehboob-ul-Haq and Amartya Sen. The difficulty is that unless consumption grows, unless consumption of the poor people grows and unless poverty is vanished, there is no question of talking of eight per cent rate of growth or five per cent rate of growth. That does not help us at all. Time and again, many conferences take place here. One took place two weeks back also. And these conferences were telling us on the same way that we are going - rate of growth of 8 per cent, seven per cent, liberalisation, globalisation. Liberalisation or globalisation has to be redefined in terms of India itself. And unless we redefine it, our difficulties will continue. Even today I was seeing in Herald Tribute that 1.2 billion dollars go out of Brazil everyday. Likewise South Korea. One trillion dollars move out everyday from there. Therefore, whenever you think in terms of reforms, whenever you think in terms of going the way as indicated by IMF and the World Bank, we must keep this in mind that the prescription that they give is not always in our national interest.

Also at the same time, we in India have been always wanting reforms of the Security Council and the UNO. It is important, but more important to us is the reform of the Brettonwood organisations. It is more important for us to reform the World Bank and the IMF. Unfortunately, these two organisations which control the economies of the world are not under the roof of the UNO itself. Only America controls them and the result of it is that a country can be impoverished overnight. For instance, look at the example of India. We took most of the loans from outside at a time when one dollar was costing Rs. 8 or Rs. 9. I do know what is its value today, but let me assume that it is between Rs. 42 and Rs. 43. This means, your debt burden has gone up five times because you have to repay it in dollars.

Mehboob-ul-Haque in one of his formulations made a very interesting formulation. He said that the developing countries are faced with a situation which prevails in the villages of this area that you pay more than what you owe. Once you have taken a debt, you can never get rid of it because it is manipulated.

I had gone to Malaysia some years ago to attend a G-15 meeting. Now, the much maligned leader of that nation, Mahathir, had raised his voice for the first time. He told us at that time in the Conference of the G-15 that some years back some amount of money had been taken as a loan by Malaysia from Japan. They did not add a penny to that, but the currency was so manipulated that the debt burden of Malaysia was multiplied several times. Since he has the courage to speak up, you are seeing the type of campaigns that have been launched against him. They will always try to crush any leader who tries to defy. Defiance can be of several types. One defiance is of the type of Mahathir, another defiance can be defiance by cooperation and that is the defiance of a country like South Korea.

For some time now, whenever we talked of the next millennium, we were talking of the next century as the century of Asia. I think, it is time for us to realise that this pride has already been neutralised. When we are getting near the next century, I do not see enthusiasm anywhere in the world. As I mentioned just now, I have travelled very extensively in the last three or four months. People are not looking at the next millennium with hope, they are not looking at the next millennium with excitement, they are not looking at the next millennium in the terms of people.

Three weeks ago I had the opportunity of attending a seminar in France and the seminar was on `Human Rights and Poverty'. We are now celebrating fiftieth year of the adoption of the Charter of Human Rights and every time we celebrate this, we turn into a mela as if State versus people and police versus offender. Though the dimensions are there, I suggested to our own Human Rights Commission that we should now think in terms of specifics, human rights and women. How do we empower women? Can any country progress without empowerment of women? That is what the Human Development Report says. It says that without development of women, there can be no change. Therefore, when we are thinking in this House whether to give 30 per cent or 35 per cent of seats to women or not, the issue should not be looked at only in terms of politics; it should be looked at in terms of development and future. If you read the reports carefully, you will find that without empowerment of women, without elimination of illiteracy and without attending to our own problems in our own ways, we cannot solve the problems. The upshot of the discussion in that seminar - I am again drawing your attention to it - was only one that every nation must go to the development perception in its own right, in its own light and in its own ethos.

Do not buy the prescription from elsewhere. I think, in this House particularly, we examine issue by issue. Sometimes, we discuss patent rights; sometimes, we discuss insurance and so on. We do not look at them collectively. We are taking view only one by one, and then parties take their own attitude.

The next millennium is coming. I strongly urge the Government that let us sit down together as a nation and decide what is our vision of the next millennium. Jargons like `liberalisation' do not help. We must learn from the experience of our neighbours. A question must loudly be asked: "What happened to tigers, why have they sunk and are we being taken and pushed in that direction or not?"

I do not want to take more time, Sir. You have been very kind to me. But I would only say this that foreign policy today is a very comprehensive approach. We are dealing with nations, we are dealing with neighbours and we are dealing with economy. I think, Shri Jaswant Singh holding the two caps -as the Minister for Planning on one side and as the Minister of Foreign Affairs on the other -- will try to marry the two. We know what he has to say about issues as such. We want to learn from him about his vision of the next millennium. Where does he want the nation to go? How does he want the nation to cope with the challenges that we are all facing?

>SHRI E. AHAMED (MANJERI): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir. After the brilliant speech from a person like Shri I.K. Gujral, I do not think that there are many points to be raised in this discussion on the foreign policy.

At the outset, I also join Shri Gujral in complimenting Shri Jaswant Singh, who has been appointed as the Minister of External Affairs. Our Prime Minister was an expert on external affairs. But having a Minister exclusively for foreign affairs was the long-standing wish of a majority of the Members of this House. It is because it will help them in at least meeting a Minister in charge of External Affairs. In this respect also, I join Shri Gujral in wishing him all the best in conducting the affairs as the Minister of External Affairs of India.

Sir, the world is celebrating the Golden Jubilee of the adoption of human rights by the United Nations. During the present Century, may I say that America is the flagrant violator of human rights. In this House, the other day, all of us have raised the issue of what they have done in Iraq. We have been asked to raise it again during this discussion. The defenceless people of Iraq have been attacked mercilessly by America and Britain, which was the head of the Commonwealth, of which we are also a member. We have seen what America has been doing in this Century. In 1945, they have dropped atom bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki eliminating 2,00,000 people. They have again started the very same thing against a defenceless country, Iraq.

We all have criticised Iraq, some years back, when it committed aggression on Kuwait. But that is a past, so far as history is concerned. But America, without any reason whatsoever, as stated by Shri Gujral, is behaving like a policeman of the world. America has utilised the United Nations cover even to do the espionage inside Iraq. The UNSCOM officials, who have the cover of the United Nations, working presumably under the instruction of the United Nations, have taken the measurements of the buildings of the defence and military installations in Iraq, and they have supplied it not only to Kofi Annan and United Nations but even to the American Defence Ministry and Pentagon enabling America to do this carpet bombing in Iraq.

Sir, it is very sad in the history of the United Nations, on whom the people have the hope, that it is also, directly or indirectly, helping such wanton attack on a defenseless country, that also on the eve of Ramazan, the holy month of Muslims in the world. Therefore, their continuing sanctions has put the great hardship and difficulties so far as the people of Iraq are concerned. Twenty million people are dying in that country for want of medicines. And, this world is now celebrating the Golden Jubilee of the adoption of Human Rights by the United Nations. This is the situation.

Sir, India has a crucial role to play in these matters. As rightly pointed out by Shri Gujralji, India is the leader of the non-aligned countries. India has its own political vision and perception given by our great leader of the country, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. At no time, India has missed the opportunity to condemn such wanton attacks on the helpless countries by the super powers. But this time, India has found only one word to deplore such a wanton attack on a defenseless country instead of condemning.

Sir, as it is pointed out by the Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq that hundreds of innocent people have lost their lives and hundreds of people are still in the hospital. Why all this is happening is because of only one thing. It is because America is very much afraid of Iraq, not that Iraq would attack on the neighbouring countries. Actually, America is very much afraid of Iraq's power that may some time turn against Israel.

The Prime Minister of India, Vajpayeeji was also very much anxious to see the Prime Minister of Israel. I have no objection to it. Let the Prime Minister see the Prime Minister of any country. But the way over-enthusiasm was shown by our Prime Minister meeting Mr. Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel, would definitely give some misgivings in the minds of Arab countries. That is what I want to say. I have no objection of our Prime Minister meeting any of the Heads of the State of the world. But this over-enthusiasm of our Government to go with Israel is not in tune with the policy which we have been adopting or following since days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Sir, this American bombing has come as a blessing in disguise. The Arabs were a little bit disintegrated in certain things. But this American bombing has made them to have Arab solidarity and revive the Arab nationalism which has been long forgotten. This bombing has revived the Arab nationalism and established solidarity with the people of Iraq.

Sir, I take this opportunity as a Member of this august House to express deepest sympathy to the people of Iraq who have been massacred and subjected to such an inhuman and reprehensible attack by American regime in collusion with the Great Britain.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI E. AHAMED : Yes, Sir, I do not want to take much of the valuable time of the House. This is also the time for me to break my fast. I would say one or two sentences about the CTBT and then conclude.

The Government of India should make abundantly clear as to what their stand is about the CTBT. Sometime back the Prime Minister said in Bangalore that it is not conducive for India to sign the CTBT.

Does it mean that if only the House will agree, he will do so? Let the Government be clear about what is the perception so far as CTBT is concerned and if there is any deviation or not.

I just conclude my speech with only a few words which I could see in one of the newspapers written by an eminent columnist, Shri Inder Malhotra. With your kind permission, I quote. It is in the best interests of the foreign affairs of our country and also of the Government of the BJP that I would like to read this quotation: -

"Not only has the BJP-led coalition failed to evolve national consensus on the nuclear issue and on such specific matters as the signing of the CTBT, but also it has failed equally miserably to educate the public opinion. Even with the Government, Shri Jaswant Singh and the Prime Minister's Principal Secretary, Mr. Brijesh Misra seem to be working at cross purposes altogether. Foreigners have got the impression that domestic discord has rendered the present Government unable to do anything about the CTBT."

I hope this Government will take it seriously as a future guideline in conducting the affairs of the country in external affairs.

>SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (LATUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, Shri Jaswant Singh is not in the House. Maybe, after a few minutes, he will come to the House. But I would like to congratulate him. He was really a de facto Foreign Minister. But now he is a de jure Foreign Minister and he will also be acting as Foreign Minister. We would like to wish him all the best. That would be in the interests of the country also. With his knowledge and capacity, I think he will be able to discharge the duties in the best possible manner.

India and the United States oft America have been talking to each other and Shri Jaswant Singh and Shri Talbot have met many times. We think that this dialogue should be continued. It is not always possible to get good results immediately when dialogues take place in one or two meetings. But if dialogue or the discussions do not take place, the possibility of misunderstanding increasing is greater and in order to avoid this kind of possibility, the dialogues are always welcome. Through this dialogue, it will be possible for India to explain its point of view to the leaders in United States of America and the concern that India feels can also be explained and if there is any misapprehension in their minds, that misapprehension, if not totally eliminated, can be reduced. It should be possible for us to find common denominator and if the denominator is found, it may become possible for us to act on the common denominator. If we come to the conclusion that there is a lot of distance between the stands taken by the two countries on certain points in certain respects, we can understand even that position and we can formulate our policies to meet the situations and eventualities which may arise out of the non-convergence of opinion between the two countries.

We think that the dialogue should be continued but when the dialogue is going on, we shall have to be very careful. We shall have to carry on the dialogue not only to explain and please but we have to carry on the dialogue to protect our interests and to do justice also. If these principles are kept in mind and I am sure that these principles are kept in mind - sometimes, a mistake here or a mistake there can take place - and if the dialogue is carried on in this fashion, it will be very useful to our countries.

Meeting too many times at too many places and too ambiguous an agenda also may not help. Meetings held with clear understanding as to what is to be achieved and what can be achieved will certainly be useful but it is not possible to lay down the principles and fix the criteria which can be used for carrying on the dialogue. It should be left to the parties which are talking to each other and certainly it will be left to our Minister of External Affairs and the representative of the United States of America.

In the statement which has been issued by the hon. Prime Minister, which is the subject matter of today's discussion, one of the points which has been dealt with is the issue of disarmament itself. When we talk about disarmament, we shall have to remember and it will be very useful to remember the speech delivered by Shri Rajiv Gandhi in 1988 in the General Assembly of the United Nations. That session was held to discuss disarmament and the speech was delivered by Shri Rajiv Gandhi. It is a very comprehensive speech which lays down the policies which India can follow with respect to disarmament. I think, the principles which are laid down in that policy can certainly be followed.

India is for reducing the nuclear weapons or any other non-conventional mass destructive weapons. India would like to go along with other countries on this point. The weapons cannot be eliminated at the first instance but they can be reduced and then they can be eliminated. This elimination of non-conventional weapons should be

done in a time frame. It is not only the non-conventional weapons which have to be reduced but the conventional weapons should also be reduced to such an extent that only the objective of defending the country can be achieved and the objective of invading a country may not be achieved. Those were the principles which were laid down in the policy framework which was submitted to the United Nations by Shri Rajiv Gandhi. By and large, the policy India has been following is the same policy. We do want to march with other countries in this respect but we do not want to be discriminated against.

Any principle which is applied for reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons in a discriminatory manner is not going to be helpful. I think, that is the stand the present Government is also taking, if I have understood the purport of the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in this respect. India is for peace and prosperity and tranquillity in the world. India wants that the world should be free from war, weapons and nuclear weapons and that would be the policy India would like to follow with respect to disarmament.

On CTBT, I think, India should cooperate. But when I say that India should cooperate, India cannot cooperate without protecting its own interest. If the interest of the country cannot be protected, it may not be possible for India to sign the CTBT; and India should not sign the CTBT if the interest of the country is not protected. India should be treated on par with other weapon possessing countries and if India is not treated on par with other weapon possessing countries, there is likely to be a discrimination against India and that position may not be possible for India to accept. When I say this, I would also like to say that it is not necessary for India to be in a hurry to sign the CTBT. If there is a time frame within which it has to be done, and if within that time frame we can arrive at a formula which can protect the interest of the country and which can also help in this matter, then there should not be any difficulty. But it is not necessary for India to be anxious to sign the CTBT or no intention should be made that the CTBT should be signed in this manner. This matter is very intricate; it has to be carefully examined and very very skilfully handled. If it is not carefully examined and skilfully handled, then the national objectives and the international objectives would not be achieved. That is why, we do think that there is scope for taking a cautious view and we have to cautiously move in this respect. On the one hand, we should march with the world and on the other hand, the interest of the country should be protected. I would like to say that India should be treated on par with other weapon possessing countries. Then only the objectives can be achieved.

As far as FMCT is concerned, the statement is very clear and there is no great scope to say anything on this. The stand that the Government has taken, I am sure, would be acceptable to all of us. Here also, we shall have to be careful. No discrimination shall be accepted. The most important point which is coming out of the discussions and the present situation is that India should not be discriminated against. If India is treated on par with other weapon possessing countries, in order to get India agree to international treaties, well, then that should be acceptable. But here also, if there is anything which discriminates against India, it may not be possible for us to accept that.

Now, let me come to export controls. We do have some technologies; very sophisticated technologies and the technologies at the horizon are also available in India. We have been careful and we are not making dangerous technologies available to any other country. We would be responsible in future also. But at the same time, we would like to say that there are dual use technologies. They have invented a formula saying that a technology can be used for the purposes of producing weapons and for other purposes also -- this is dual use technology. But in my opinion, everything that is happening in the area of advanced technology can be used for many purposes. It can be used for helping human beings or it can be used for producing anything or it can be used for destructive purposes also.

The distinction between the technologies which can be used for war purposes or for the purposes of destruction and the technologies used for helping humanbeings is very much reduced. You take any technology, like electronic technology, genetic technology, space technology and communication technology. Any technology can be used for dual purposes. The distinction is very very minimal. That is why this formula or theory of dual purpose is not at all relevant. This formula can be used against any country to deny any particular technology to a country. I think there is a lot of scope to carry on discussion on this point. Now, India can take a stand that this theory of dual purpose should not be applied blindly without understanding the implications of it and without understanding which technology cannot be used for dual purpose. I am not sure whether this point was taken up

for discussion that took place between our Foreign Minister and the representative of United States of America. There is a lot of scope to speak on this point. One cannot deny any technology to India on the ground that it can be used for defence purposes or for the purposes of producing weapons. This should not be there. We would like to urge upon the Foreign Minister to discuss this issue a little more carefully and try to reduce the sanctions which are imposed on the technologies which can be given to India. There is very little scope for distinguishing which technology can be used for dual purpose and which cannot be. We would like the Indian representative to be very careful and try to gain something on this point.

Now, let me come to defence postures. India has won freedom by using non-violence. India has not invaded any country. But war had been inflicted on India five times. I am not saying that it is four times, because I am including the conflict in Rann of Kachchh. Willy-nilly, India had to defend itself. India had to protect its sovereignty, its territory, its borders, its interests, and its people. India cannot refuse to defend itself. India has to defend itself. India can pledge to the world that India will not invade any other country, but India has to defend itself. India will not fail in its duty.

While talking about the nuclear weapons it is said that India will not be the first country to use the nuclear weapons aganist any country. I do not know whether it was necessary to make this statement or not. We could have followed this principle even without making this statement. Once we have made this statement, there is nothing wrong in it. Even without making this statement, we would have done the same thing. Had we not made this statement, some defence advantage would have been available to us.

India is very correct in making a statement that India will not use the nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear State. We can keep on repeating this statement. Why is India trying to have nuclear weapons? It has been made very clear that our purpose is very limited, that it is to defend ourselves. We do not want to compete with the United States of America or for that matter with any other country which is having the nuclear weapons.

We cannot be equated with other countries. We are very advanced in these areas. Our purpose is very limited and for that limited purpose we have a right to be vigilant and a right to prepare ourselves for any eventuality. We will rightly prepare ourselves to face any eventuality. The Defence posture of ours is correct.

As far as the missile technology is concerned, we do not find any difference of opinion. To a very large extent we tend to agree with what has been said with respect to the Defence technology and Defence manufacturers on this point.

Having said this much, I would like to say that while trying to have good relationships with the United States of America, let us not concentrate only on the nuclear technology, nuclear weapons or anything of this sort. There are many other areas in which India and the United States of America can cooperate with each other. It would be useful to concentrate on those areas and try to find out as to how we can strengthen our relationship with them. There is a lot of scope in trade and commerce. In trade and commerce, India can cooperate, coordinate its activities and this should be looked into.

There is a scope for helping the industry in India, America as also in the Third-world countries. Nowadays, we are helping each other in matters which are in the realm of Services. There also, we will try to do it in a manner that our interests are protected. The third area is the area of Science and Technology. This is really a very important area. The scope of cooperation in this area is getting limited because of the theory of `dual use technology'. This theory has to be discarded and we shall have to increase our cooperation in Science and Technology. There is a lot of scope in electronics. If others can prepare the hardware, we can prepare the software. There is a lot of scope in genetics. In the area of genetics, India is one of the richest countries in the world as far as genetic resources are concerned and America is one of the countries in the world which does not have the genetic resources but does have the genetic technology. If genetic technology and genetic resources can come together, it will not only be good for India or America but for other countries of the world as a whole. Informatics and communication are the other areas in which we can cooperate. We have cooperated in Space technology. Some of our satellites were launched in America and there is a scope for cooperating in that area also. One of the biggest areas in which there can be a long-term futuristic cooperation is the area of knowledge. If we emphasise on this area, there would be very useful cooperation between the United States of America and

India. We shall have to explore these areas. We shall have to carefully prepare to cooperate. We shall have a vision as to how to cooperate. We should go one step ahead to plan as to how to cooperate and then we should acquire the wherewithal required to cooperate in these areas.

It is very good that India has discussed some of these important matters with Russia, France, Japan and other countries. I think there has not been much of a dialogue between the United Kingdom and India.

Now if that is so, let us explain to them our point of view and let us understand their point of view also. That will help us to find out as to where we agree and as to where we do not agree. Where we agree, we cooperate with each other, where we do not agree, we have our own plans and we have our own strategies to help ourselves. That would be very necessary.

Today, we are discussing the relationship between India and United States of America and fortunately for us, we have the Prime Minister of Russia in our country. We have seen on television and are reading in the newspapers also that India and Russia have signed about seven agreements. Now, this kind of cooperation will certainly be very useful. The erstwhile USSR and India were cooperating and now also we are cooperating. The United States of America and India cooperated before Independence. After Independence, if there was some scope for talking to each other to remove misunderstanding, we did that also and there is scope for that. Now, India has been talking to these countries. It is good. I think, Japan is one of the countries to which we shall have to talk a little more because the statements which have come from Japan are little more disconcerting. I do think that there is a scope for speaking to Japan also on this matter. Now, we have to speak with United Kingdom also.

Now, it is said that the present Government would like to discuss the matters with other parties. I think, the present Government has discussed the matters with other parties and I think they should continue discussing the matters with other parties. But may I say one thing? If you discuss a matter with other parties and you arrive at conclusions and use the same matter in elections to say that this is your policy and this policy has succeeded, is it correct? It has to be avoided. If it is a policy of the country and if it is a policy of the entire Parliament and the people, the credit for it should not be taken by one party. If the credit is taken by one party, I think, other parties will be more careful while expressing their agreement to the proposals made by you and there will be a hurdle in your real discussion on this matter. Now, did the Government make use of what happened when the Government came to power in an election? If the Government did make use of that thing, probably it is enough to disrupt the consensus which should be there on defence and foreign matters. The Defence Policy is something which should arise out of agreement between all the parties. If one party is trying to take advantage of it, the scope for arriving at an agreement is limited. The External Affairs Policy is a Policy which should arise out of the consensus between the parties. Here and there some divergent opinions may be expressed. But the agreement should be there. If this agreement is not used for partisan purposes, political purposes and electioneering, then it will be good. I do think that this has to be there.

By and large, we, from the Congress Party, would like to cooperate in matters relating to Defence, External Affairs and long term planning. But at the same time, we are free and we are duty bound to criticise the Government where our views are different from the Government. On those points, we are not going to mince words. On the one hand, we will not criticise the Government for the sake of criticism. But on the other hand, we will not spare the Government where criticism is required and where our views are completely different. By and large, there is scope for agreement and we should arrive at agreement. But we do think that the Government has expressed its views to arrive at agreements yet on some points, the Government has committed some errors because of which it has not been fully possible to agree with the Government's point of view also.

18.00 hrs.

I do think that with this kind of approach, let us have a defence policy which can defend our country; let us have an external affairs policy which can help us to protect our interests, protect the interests of the people in the world, protect the interests of peace, tranquility and prosperity of the people throughout the world.

>SHRI C. GOPAL (ARAKKONAM): Respected Chairman, Sir, I will put my views on behalf of my Party and my leader Dr. Puratchi Thailavi on the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in this House with regard to

bilateral talks with the United States.

As the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, our hon. Minister has played a very important role with regard to our foreign policy and he visited many nations. During this right time, he is given the charge of the Minister of External Affairs. Therefore, on behalf of my Party, I congratulate him now.

Our foreign policy is now criticised by one group and it is appreciated by the ruling party group. On behalf of myself, I want to start my point from the year 1947. Our nation has been adopting our policies against foreigners for the past fifty years. In the year 1947, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru through a radio broadcast to the nation, gave our nation's view on foreign policy. He said and I quote:

"We shall take full part in international conference as a free nation with our own policy and not merely as a satellite of another nation. We hope to develop close and direct contacts with other nations and cooperate with them in the furtherance of world peace and freedom. We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disaster even on a vaster scale."

I want to point out what our policy is today. I want to put some points with regard to bilateral talks with United States. India's commitment to global nuclear disarmament remains undiluted. India has maintained that a nuclear weapon free world would enhance not only our security but the security of all nations. Indo-US relations particularly in the economic field are broadened and diversified. US also remains India's largest trade and investment partner.

1804 hours (Shri Raghuvansh Prasad Singh in the Chair)

Only in the month of May, 1998, our Government conducted nuclear test. Even at that time, it was criticised by the Congress Party also. My humble submission would be that the nuclear test conducted in May 1998 was a continuation of the decision taken nearly 25 years ago.

Only in the month of May, 1998, our Government conducted nuclear test. Even at that time, it was criticised by the Congress Party also. My humble submission would be that the nuclear test conducted in May 1998 was a continuation of the decision taken nearly 25 years ago.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi was taking more interest. Shri Rajiv Gandhi was also taking more interest. But only when credit went to our hon. Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, that the intention came to the minds of the Congress people. It is not only India's nuclear tests held in May 1998 that brought about a new twist in the Indo-U.S. relations. At that time, the reaction of the United States was critical and harsh. Also, in the wake of the tests conducted by India and Pakistan, a joint statement was issued by China and the United States during Mr. Clinton's visit to China. At that time also, our foreign policy was criticised. That is why, I am making this point now. Even at that time, India categorically rejected the statement and described its approach as entirely unacceptable.

India's foreign policy with regard to the attack on Iraq is very much essential to be mentioned at this time. Everybody is watching what is the option of India in regard to this policy. I want to submit before this House that killing of people anywhere and for any purpose is wrong. Whatever reasons one may give to vindicate such an action but the military strikes by the United States and Britain are unacceptable. Of course, the attack has been stopped now. The strikes by the United States and Britain flagrantly violated the norms of the international law and openly ignored the world communities efforts to settle the situation.

At the time of the incident, what is the view of this nation? At the right time, our hon. Minister of External Affairs said that the air strikes on Iraq were deplorable and a matter of grave concern; and differences over the implementation of the Security Council resolutions by Iraq ought to have been resolved through negotiations and dialogue, and India wanted military operations to be halted immediately. Therefore, my humble submission would be that on that incident, our leader Dr. Puratchi Thalaivi had released a statement saying that it is

unfortunate that on the eve of the holy month of Ramadan, the people of Iraq are getting not relief from their privations but a rain of bombs. She also released a statement stating:

"The bombing of Iraq by the United States and the United Kingdom thus amounts to a crime against humanity, and as such deserves international censure. I call upon the Prime Minister to immediately get moved a resolution in the United Nations General Assembly calling for the immediate cessation both of the bombing as well as all sanctions against Iraq."

But, anyhow, my humble submission would be that I want to appreciate the hon. Prime Minister because at the right time he has issued the proper statement.

Sir, I want to put my views on Indo-Pakistan relationship. There is a dispute between Pakistan and India. I want to bring the incident of 1947 to the knowledge of this House. In 1947, the State of Jammu and Kashmir everybody knows and our eminent leaders know - refused to join Pakistan and they only had opted for India. Pakistani leadership has since argued that if a majority area can remain part of India, then the raison d'etre of Pakistan collapses. That is their attitude and that is their idea. But as far as Indian leadership is concerned, likewise we believe that being the only Muslim majority State in India, Kashmir is central to India's philosophy of secular nationalism. That is why, till today clashes between two nations are continuing.

Foreign policy is popularly believed to be based on a broad national consensus. As far as our relations with the United States are concerned, talks are being conducted on the basis of a comprehensive platform that India has put forward on disarmament and non-proliferation matters, our unilateral moratorium, willingness to discuss converting it into de jure obligation, our offer to enter into constructive negotiations and reaffirming our policies on stringent control on export of sensitive technologies.

I want to put forward some suggestions with regard to India - Pakistan relationship. The official dialogue between India and Pakistan at the level of Foreign Secretaries, as well as interaction at political levels, were resumed only in 1997. Our respected former Prime Minister, Shri Gujral met his Pakistani counterpart four times. Through those meetings, India's concern regarding Pakistani's activities which impinge adversely on India's security and national interest, were conveyed, as well as its desire to establish a relationship of trust, friendship and cooperation with Pakistan.

Disagreement of our views with Pakistan again started only after we conducted nuclear tests. Our hon. Prime Minister on 14th June, 1998 wrote a letter to Prime Minister, Mr. Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan that their presence in and to decide how the dialogue process could be carried forward. The Prime Minister also said that India was committed to fostering a peaceful and friendly relationship and developing a stable structure of cooperation between the two countries.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan Shri Nawaz Sharif replied on 23rd June, 1998 agreeing with the Indian Prime Minister's suggestion to hold talks while in Colombo. In spite of this statement of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, what is the attitude of Pakistan towards India? The international community also recognised that all outstanding issues between India and Pakistan should be settled bilaterally, in a peaceful manner. But Pakistan is continuing its attack on Indian posts and since September this year, it made 11 attempts to capture our posts. India has also foiled another attempt to capture one of the world's highest posts, Bila Top. India and Pakistan have also expelled one staff member each of their High Commissions in New Delhi and Islamabad on charges of espionage. This is the attitude of Pakistan towards India. Anyhow, our Prime Minister has reiterated that there is no place, whatsoever, for any third party mediation in respect of Kashmir. It is also categorically stated by our country and our Prime Minister that we should not give room for any third party negotiations. The US State Department's Annual Report on Patterns of Global Terrorism, which was released on 30th April, 1998, also stated that there were continuing reports of official Pakistani support to terrorist activities in India. As far as our relationship with Pakistan is concerned, our hon. Prime Minister is riding on the right path without compromising the integrity of the nation. This is my humble submission.

As far as Katchatheevu is concerned, I would like to say that once it was a part and parcel of India. It was ruled by a Tamilian called Sethupathi Raja. But Shri Karunanidhi, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has given it to Sri

Lanka.

SHRI S.S. PALANIMANICKAM (THANJAVUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it was given by the Central Government. (Interruptions)

SHRI C. GOPAL : Sir, he does not know the history. (Interruptions) When Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister, this matter was referred to the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. But it was not objected by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, even though he is always talking about Tamilians by saying that he is living for Tamilians. Now, the fishermen of Tamil Nadu are suffering a lot and even, day-before-yesterday, 16 fishermen from Tamil Nadu were detained in Jaffna. Therefore, Katchatheevu must become a part and parcel of our country and I would request that necessary steps should be taken by the Government in this regard. Our leader is also raising her voice on this issue.

So, in the end, I would like to appreciate the statement made by the Prime Minister. With these words I conclude my speech.

>SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN (TRICHUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the world today is not the same as it was a week ago. Vast changes have taken place in the international situation. Out of the five member UN Security Council, the two big powers, the United States of America and Britain have violated the United Nations' Charter, the Rules of the UN Security Council and the attack on Iraq by the United States of America and Britain is not only an attack on Iraq alone.

It is an attack against the United Nations. It is an attack especially against the Third-World countries. Three out of the five permanent Members of the Security Council - the People's Republic of China, Russia and France - warned against this attack. Even then, the missile attack and the cruel bombardment on civilian people went on for four nights. Even after they stopped the attack, yesterday, the Secretary of State of the United States, that is, their Foreign Minister, appeared on the TV and said: "We are free to attack again at any time." That is a challenge against humanity. So, the things have changed vastly. We are not discussing the two statements of our hon. Prime Minister alone. We have to take stock of this new situation. But the United States of America and Britain, as the erstwhile imperialist powers, have challenged the nations that their brute power will be imposed for their interests. Mr. Bill Clinton was frank enough to say, "To safeguard the interests of America, we will do that." They will go against the United Nations. They will go against the Security Council. They will go against humanity. That was bluntly told by Mr. Bill Clinton. That was repeated yesterday by the Secretary of State of the United States. How are we going to face this? That is a crucial question now facing the Government of India and the nation.

The root-cause of enmity towards Iraq of the erstwhile imperialist powers is that after the Second World War, they were bold to nationalise their oilfields unlike the other Arab nations. Has the country not a right to do that? That is the root-cause of this enmity. In attacking this independent country, their claims are utterly false. I do not go extensively on that point because I fear the Chairman will ring the Bell.

When we deal with America, what are they doing towards us? They have not yet sent the missiles. They have not warned the Navy when their ships armed with nuclear heads went from Diego Garcia to the Gulf countries. But in the name of sanctions, they are pressurising us. Please excuse me when I say that. I see that Government of India is succumbing to their pressure.

Yesterday, the Chairman of the New York International Insurance Company in Delhi gave a Press statement. He is eagerly waiting the fate of our IRA Bill. He is in Delhi.

Sir, for what else they want exclusive marketing rights for their fair produce in India? They want to capture the market of 98 crore of people. Are we going to succumb to them? If we amend our Patent Bill, the model Patent Bill, and open up our market for exclusive marketing right, what will be the fate of this country?

Yes, the economic affairs are interlocked with our Foreign Policy. How do we deal with these erstwhile imperialist powers, that is a crucial thing. If Iraq had opened up its oilfields, there would have been no missiles,

no bombardment. Saddam is a very good diplomat and gentleman. We are facing erstwhile economic powers on economic field. The question is how to face them and how to deal with them. Our Foreign Policy is interconnected with the Economic Policy.

Sir, they are out to plunder this country. They are out to capture the key sectors of our economy. If we yield to them, our nation will not survive. We may find out so many reasons. Economic Pundits are saying that we can also export. True, we have to export our produce, we have to balance our exports and imports policy. If we are aseptic against the United States, they may do some harm to us in the European market, in the United States market and even in the Japanese market.

We are 98.84 crore people here in India. This is a vast market. We do not go to Europe or anywhere. If you reform the Agricultural Sector, if you enact fundamental land reform and improve the purchasing power of the rural poor, the poorest of the peasantry, the purchasing power of the 98 crore people will lead us to industrial revolution, industrial development and our economy will be strengthened. That is what I understand from Swadeshi. We are now facing Swadeshi and globalisation. Globalisation is very good to say but you are projecting the vast masses of a great nation. You are restructuring your economic policy.

I am sorry for this offence to the Congress Party. After Panchmarhi, we thought that they may make some changes to some extent. Panchmarhi was a hope for us, as far as Congress is concerned. But after Panchmarhi, even today, what we see now? The Congress Party is on the same footing and at the same low to plunder this country. They have hedged the Congress Party and the BJP together. This may temporarily sabotage the fundamental structure of this nation. But I would like to remind them that the people will not forget them.

The victories of Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh are after the Panchmarhi session. They gave some hope that they were changing, but today they are not changing, they are far ahead of BJP in allowing the international capital, the multi-nationals, the erstwhile imperialistic powers to reenter our economic sectors and plunder this country and loot this country. I would also like to bring it to their notice that when they talk with the Americans, they must keep in mind our Foreign Policy.

On CTBT, we have not much difference.

SHRI C.P. RADHAKRISHNAN (COIMBATORE): We are happy that their offer has been rejected by the Congress Party.

SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN :How can we strengthen our security? In my humble opinion, our security cannot be strengthened by nuclear weaponisation in this modern world. Nuclear weaponisation is nothing in this modern world. Our security can be strengthened by strengthening our bond with our allies, namely, the Third-world countries, China and Russia. If we come together and have agreements, as we did yesterday with Russia, and friendship with the vast masses of the Third-world countries, that is the only guarantee for our security. Nuclear weaponisation is not the way.

>SHRIMATI KRISHNA BOSE (JADAVPUR): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I rise to take part in this debate, I am overwhelmed with a sense of great responsibility.

The international community today faces a very difficult situation. All of us have to be very sensible and balanced. Perhaps, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kofi Annan, struck the right note when he said that the need of the hour is a heeling diplomacy. I hope and pray that my country will play a significant role in the application of that heeling diplomacy.

Sir, we are debating the statement of the hon. Prime Minister which he made in this House. But we have been overtaken by events and we have to mention the events of the last few days. The hon. Prime Minister's statement has to be examined in the backdrop of what happened in the last few days. We have seen a face of America which has made us apprehensive. The Indo-U.S. talks are going on. We have a very distinguished interlocutor in Shri Jaswant Singh, but we have to be very cautious after we saw in the last few days.

In this House, we have unanimously deplored the aggression of the Iraqi people by America. The Americans have violated the international law in the name of protecting the international law. The Iraqi people were suffering already because of the very cruel sanctions imposed on them for the last eight years. Children are dying there because of lack of medicine and because of malnutrition. After that came the bombardment. I do not see why the Iraqi people have to be punished because of the transgression of their dictator. I am shocked by the role that Britain played in this and that also Tony Blair's Britain. I could not believe that Hugh Gateskel's Party is sort of playing a second fiddle to America, in America's indiscriminate, if I may use the word, international terrorism. How can we forget that when Anthony Eden's Tory Government attacked Egypt during the Suez Canal crisis, it was Hugh Gateskel who had raised his voice of protest as the Opposition Leader at that time? However, world opinion has now separated and isolated the USA and Britain. We have heard the viewpoint of Russian Prime Minister, who is with us at the moment. We have also heard the voices of China and France.

What is most heartening is this, that the American general public and the academicia have not supported this aggression. Their feeling is somewhat like this: That in trying to contain what is termed a `rogue state', they are appearing to be a rogue state themselves and they do not appreciate that sort of an attitude.

This aggression is clearly counter-productive. It has brought hurt and suffering to the people of Iraq. But it has not touched Saddam at all. He loves this, he triumphs on this war psychosis. He is a despot. People have to rally round him when such a situation arises.

I have to say one thing, that we must have some sort of a mechanism with which we can control troublesome states like Saddam's Iraq. But that must be based on world opinion or that must be a consensus and unilateral aggression cannot be the answer to that. But a little while ago Shri Gujral did point out that the United Nations which was such an organisation had been undermined in this and may be apart from the people of Iraq the only other casualty has been the United nations. Because the Unscom, the Inspection Commission which was working there had come to a stop and they could never go back and do anything there.

The Prime Minister had called upon us that we should have an armaments-free world where the security of all the nations will be taken into account.

Now we heard, or we have read that Mr. Richard Butler the Inspector of the Commission had said that Iraq had amassed what they called, WMD, Weapons of Mass Destruction from the days of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Vietnam, Korea, down to Baghdad and that when we go nuclear we have to hear the criticism of the United States Government. We are aware that our Government and the United States are in the midst of a very delicate negotiation.

As I have already said, we have a very good interlocutor on our side. The negotiations are in a delicate stage. We must not say anything or do anything which will jeopardise them. We have to be very cautious in the negotiations. We have kept our nuclear options open till l998 and we exercised our options, as we all know, in May and we ended the nuclear ambiguity. But at the same time, we have told the world that our nuclear capabilities are of a defensive nature. We have told the world that we only want, what we say, a minimum credible deterrent. We have declared a moratorium voluntarily. Now whether our voluntary moratorium should be a de jure one is for you to consider. I should think that we will leave it to our scientists to decide. If they think that we have enough of data, if they think that we do not need more tests, we can go into that.

The Prime Minister has said that we have focussed the attention on four things. The CTBT is one of them. The Prince of Denmark, Hamlet, said, "To be, or not to be" That is the question. That is, to sign or not to sign, seems to be the question. I do not believe what the other side said that if we sign the CTBT we shall be doing an abject surrender, as if it will be a surrender of our sovereignty. Or, they see a conspiracy in everything. I do not say that.

Our signature is necessary for the treaty to come into force. We do not wish to be identified as a permanent dissident, who are trying to block this treaty. But we shall abide by our national interest. As I said, we shall abide by what our scientists say. One of the Republican Senators - I forgot his name - had made a cynical remark about

India. He said that now to make India sign the treaty is like closing the stable door when the horses have fled. It may be so. But we have to take care of our security.

Regarding the other three points, particularly, on FMCT, we have said that fissile material production will continue. Regarding export controls, we have restrained ourselves. About defence posture security, we have said that we believe that a non-discriminatory application of the treaty will be possible.

Sir, at the backdrop of all these things, I have a feeling that India has a chance to reclaim its traditional role as the leader of the non-aligned nations now. As a friend of the Arab world and the Third World nations, we can rely on our traditional allies like Russia.

Many of us in this House including myself had reservations about going nuclear. But I must say that on the negotiating table, we are today in a much stronger position because of that. I would urge upon the Opposition to rally behind the Prime Minister so that he has a stronger position.

I would like to conclude by reminding you that Rabindranath Tagore talked about Viswa Maitri when the Second World War was raging. I hope that all of us will take India towards effecting Viswa Maitri in this world.

>SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (ULUBERIA): As our Party hon. Member, Shri Rupchand Pal had explained in details our views on the subject, the scope of the discussion will be extended widely. So, I am not going into the details of all those things because as I am told, my time is only limited.

I want certain clarifications on the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister. At first, I want a clarification on CTBT where he has said that India remains committed to converting our voluntary moratorium into a de jure obligation. I want a clarification from my hon. friend and Minister what is the reaction of U.S.A. regarding our declaration of this voluntary moratorium into a de jure obligation because you had a long discussion stretching up to nine rounds. I want to know that first.

I want to raise certain questions. Probably, I have got 10 questions. In the same statement, the Prime Minister has said that we are prepared to bring the discussion to a successful conclusion because you have a different perception. I do not know whether you have a different stand. For 50 years, we have a different perception with U.S.A. So, in that context, when you say that you want to bring the discussion into a successful conclusion, actually what are you contemplating as `successful discussion'? You are coming together on what idea? Where do we differ? Where are we coming together on those differences? It is because all were closed door discussions. So, we want to know how you have bridged those gaps. We want some categorical analysis on those discussions. It will help us in understanding the statement in a better perspective.

The other point is that we have announced a new version of Agni with an extended range. I want to know whether during the discussions with Mr. Talbott, they have raised any objection regarding this Indian Missile Development Programme, especially on the question of the extended version of it. If they raised any objection, then what is our reaction because now they are not international police, they are now international bandit. Now, in the post-Cold War situation, they think that they can do anything to anybody. So, in this situation, I want to know categorically what is their reaction on this issue and what is your reply to that.

Another point you have made in this statement is: "This Government remains unequivocally opposed to any suggestions that seek to place India at a technological disadvantage through intrusive or sovereignty violative measures." I want to know whether during the Seventh meeting at Rome, U.S. made any suggestions which put India at technological disadvantage and which is violative to our sovereignty. If so, what is our Government's position on that?

The next point in the statement is that discussions have also taken place with UK and China at your level. I want to know what was the response of both these countries, that is, U.K. and China to the new nuclear policy which this Government has declared, and also what is the U.S. reaction to that declared policy. He can clarify those positions which will help us to understand their policy.

Along with that, he has mentioned the names of another four countries - France, Russia, Germany and Japan. With these countries also they have discussed. What is their reaction to this Government's declared new nuclear policy, I want to know that also because that will help us to understand the international position vis-a-vis our policy.

It is also reported that India has been bargaining for dual-use technology. What is the response of the U.S. and France with whom we have had discussions at political level? I want some clarification on what is their reaction on the dual-use technology and whether we will accept their reaction or we will take our independent policy in this regard.

I also want a clarification whether the Prime Minister has protested against the breach caused to the continuation of talks by the major foreign policy address on South Asia at the Brooking's Institution on November 12 by one of the key U.S. interlocutors, Mr. Talbott. If so, what is the reply of the U.S. President to our Prime Minister because our Prime minister has written a letter on that? We want to know what is the reply of Mr. Clinton to that letter.

Another question is whether you have had discussions with non-nuclear States regarding CTBT and other nuclear issues. If so, what is their reaction? Have they been convinced or not? If they have been convinced, then why have they voted against us in the U.N. General A[ssembly? Did we fail to convince them or what is the reason? I want to have some clarification on that also.

Then, there is another question. We want good bilateral relations with neighbouring countries and international community also. But the hon. Prime Minister had written a letter to Clinton after conducting the nuclear tests. I want to know if Clinton is our headmaster. We have difference with you, but we will settle it here. At the same time, I cannot tolerate his writing a letter with folded hands to Clinton. He is not our headmaster. What was the necessity for him to write a letter and inform him about the tests? Now, he is attacking another country to save his character. We are not going to take lecture from him. What is his reaction to it? I want a clarification from him.

Regarding Iraq also, I told that they are doing dacoity and they are doing this type of banditry. We want to condemn that. The whole world has condemned it. The Government has only deplored it. We want that the Government should condemn the attack. We should not do this just for appeasing America. If they are wrong, we have to show them their correct position. That is the independent position of our country.

Finally, Sir, Mr. Primakov is here and his speech is encouraging. He has said that we can have good relations with countries around us, including China. We are not against anybody, but after having good relations with other countries around us, we can be able to stall the US-dominated world order. This world order means domination of US. They want to dominate all. We want to counter that. If we take the statement made by Mr. Primakov into account, we can be able to play a meaningful role in this region.

With these questions, I thank you. I hope, I will get the reply.

>

श्री शांता कुमार (कांगड़ा): सभापति जी, पोखरण के बाद की चर्चा और आज की चर्चा में एक बुनियादी अंदर है। उस समय पोखरण के परीक्षण की गर्मी थी, चर्चा में तलखी थी और कई बार लगा कि आलोचना के लिए आलोचना हुई। लेकिन आज विपक्ष के अधिकतर माननीय सदस्यों की तरफ से एक सुखद, रचनात्मक, सुझावात्मक भावना से परिपूर्ण चर्चा के लिए मैं उनका धन्यवाद करता हूं।

सभापति जी, अमरीका के साथ जो बातचीत हो रही है और इस संदर्भ में हमारी जो विदेश-नीति है, मैं समझता हूं उसमें मुख्य रूप से देश की सुरक्षा को सर्वोपरि रखा गया है, देश की सुरक्षा के बारे में मुख्य रूप से विचार किया गया है, चिंतन किया गया है और शस्त्र-रहित एक शांतिपूर्ण विश्व का निर्माण हो, उसके प्रति प्रतिबद्धता को भी स्पष्ट रूप से वर्णित किया गया है। इस दिशा में भारत का जो प्रयत्न है, हमारा जो कमिटमेंट है, एक ऐसे विश्व का निर्माण जिसमें शस्त्र न हों, शांति हो। लेकिन हम केवल ख्यालों और ख्वाबों में ही न रहें बल्कि जमीनी सच्चाई के प्रति भी जागरुक रहें। इसलिए मिनिमम क़ैडिबल डिटेरेंट की बात को भी कहा गया है। आदर्श और यथार्थ को मिलाने की कोशिश इसमें की गयी है और उसका कारण हमारे चारों तरफ की मौजूदा परिस्थितियां हैं। मैं यह समझता हूं कि इस बात की बहुत चर्चा हो चुकी है, पाकिस्तान जिस तरीके से हमारे खिलाफ काम करता रहा है, जिस तरीके से उग्रवाद को बढ़ावा देकर हमारे देश में फैलाता रहा है, वह सब जानते हैं। कश्मीर में, पंजाब में सारी की सारी परिस्थितियां इसकी गवाह हैं जिसमें न जाने कितना खर्च भारत का हुआ है और ४०-५० हजार

बेगुनाहों की जाने गयी हैं। एक बात जिसकी ओर विशेष ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए कि अफगानिस्तान में कई वर्षों से जो घटनाएं घट रही हैं, वहां धार्मिक जुनून से सम्बद्ध तालिबान को पाकिस्तान ने बढ़ाया, उकसाया और हर प्रकार की मदद की।

यदि तालिबान का पूरे का पूरा शिकंजा अफगानिस्तान पर कस जाता है तो वह और पाकिस्तान मिल कर हिन्दुस्तान के लिए बहुत बड़ा खतरा बन सकते हैं। वैसे जिस तरीके से पाकिस्तान व्यवहार करता रहा है और फिर चीन भी एक महाशक्ति के रूप में अणु बम लेकर खड़ा था, इन सारी परिस्थितियों को ध्यान में रख कर जहां विश्व शांति के प्रति हम अपने कमिटमैंट को जाहिर करें, वहीं जमीन की सच्चाइयों के प्रति आंखें बंद न करें, यह ध्यान मुख्य रूप से भारत की विदेश नीति में रहा है। इस दृष्टि से दो बातें विशेष रूप से हुईं - एक पोखरण का परीक्षण करके हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े हो गए। यह बात बिल्कुल ठीक कही गई कि आज हमारा देश विश्व के देशों के साथ बातचीत करता है तो उसमें पहले से अन्तर दिखाई देता है। अब यह देश कमजोर नहीं है। अब यह देश एटॉमिक न्यूक्लियर पावर के रूप में खड़ा है। एक बड़ी बात यह है कि पहले जब यह समाचार आते थे कि पाकिस्तान ने एटम बम बना लिया है और पाकिस्तान के लोग खुले आम इसकी घोषणा करते थे तो देश के लोगों और सुरक्षा बलों में हीन भावना आती थी कि वह देश जो प्रतिदिन हमारे साथ प्रॉक्सी वार कर रहा है, शक्तिशाली हो रहा है, उसके पास एटम बम और न्यूक्लियर शक्ति है और हमारे देश के पास नहीं है। यह हीन भावना, निराशा और हताशा की भावना उनमें आती थी लेकिन पोखरण परीक्षण के बाद वह भावना समाप्त हुई है। देश के लोगों में आत्मसम्मान, स्वाभिमान और सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से आत्मनिर्भरता की भावना आई है। इस देश ने पोखरण परीक्षण करके बहुत बड़ी ऐतिहासिक उपलब्धि प्राप्त की लेकिन यही काफी नहीं था। पाकिस्तान के साथ बातचीत को आगे बढ़ाना एक बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि है। इससे पहले पाकिस्तान के साथ बातचीत बंद हो चुकी थी। ढाका में बातचीत की कड़ी टूटी तो दुबारा जुड़ न सकी। इस सरकार के आने के बाद आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी और श्री जसवंत सिंह जी के प्रयत्नों के कारण जो प्रगति हुई, मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि है।

महोदय, इसमें विशेष बात यह है कि शिमला समझौते के बाद यह पहला मौका है कि कम्पोजिट डॉयलॉग पर, प्री-नैगोशिएटिड एजेंडा पर पाकिस्तान से बातचीत हो रही है। यह विदेश नीति की बहुत बड़ी उपलब्धि है कि हमने न्यूक्लियर शक्ति बन कर आत्मनिर्भरता प्राप्त की और पाकिस्तान के साथ बातचीत का दौर भी शुरु किया। विदेश नीति के प्रति सरकार का जो दृष्टिकोण रहा, उसका परिणाम है कि आज कश्मीर की स्थिति सम्भली है। पोखरण का परीक्षण, पाकिस्तान के साथ बातचीत, हिन्दुस्तान का शक्तिशाली होना, उसके कारण कश्मीर में परिस्थिति अच्छी हुई है।

महोदय, जब पोखरण परीक्षण किया गया था तो इकोनमिक सैंक्शन्स का बहुत बड़ा भय देश में व्याप्त करने की कोशिश की गई लेकिन यह साबित हो गया है कि भारत ने उन सारे आर्थिक प्रतिबंधों को सहन किया, भारत की इकोनौमी को सरवाइव किया। यह भारत की विदेश नीति की बहुत बड़ी सफलता है।

सार्क सम्मेलन में पाकिस्तान की कोशिश के बावजूद कश्मीर का विषय नहीं उठाया गया। परोक्ष रूप से बहुत से देशों ने भारत का समर्थन किया। अफ्रीका में, डरबन में, गुट निरपेक्ष देशों की सभा में बहुत से छोटे देशों ने भारत का समर्थन किया।

मैं अंत में दो बातें और कहना चाहता हूं। यहां कहा गया कि ५० हजार करोड़ रुपए वेपनाइजेशन पर खर्च होंगे। मैं समझता हूं कि देश की सुरक्षा सर्वोपरि है। देश की सुरक्षा के लिए मुझे मालूम नहीं कितना खर्चा होगा लेकिन खर्चे की बात हमारे सामने नहीं है। मुख्य बात यह है कि भारत की सुरक्षा को न गिरवी रखा जा सकता है, न भारत की सुरक्षा पर किसी किस्म की इस प्रकार की अनिश्चय की स्थिति को रखा जा सकता है। यहां पहले भी इस पर चर्चा हुई थी।

19.00 hrs.

श्सभापति महोदय, हमने १९६२ में देखा है। कई बार धोखा खाया है। एक तरफ चीन तो दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान खड़े हैं और अफगानिस्तान में तालिबान का शिकंजा कसा जा रहा है। इन सारी स्थितियों में इस बात पर विचार नहीं करना चाहिये कि देश की सुरक्षा पर कितना खर्चा होता है। हमारे सामने एक बात और आई कि उन्होंने हमें आणविक शक्ति स्वीकार नहीं किया। हमने मैट्रिक की परीक्षा तो दी नहीं कि हमें उसका सर्टिफिकेट मिलेगा। कोई माने या न माने, भारत अब आणविक शक्ति बन गया है। अमरीका ने सैंक्शन्स इसलिये लगाई क्योंकि वह भारत को आणविक शक्ति समझता है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूं कि भारत की विदेश नीति और अमरीका के साथ जो बातचीत हुई है, वह सफलता के साथ चल रही है। मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि विपक्ष के नेताओं ने श्री जसवंत सिंह जी की सफलता पर उनको बधाई दी है और हम भी सरकार को बधाई देते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, मैं श्री शिवराज पाटिल की इस बात से सहमत हूं कि देश की विदेश नीति और सुरक्षा किसी पार्टी की नहीं होती, किसी सरकार की नहीं होती बल्कि पूरे राष्ट्र की होती है और पूरे राष्ट्र की होनी चाहिये। माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने इस प्रकार के मुख्य विषयों पर सलाह की है और मुझे विश्वास है कि वे इस प्रकार के मुख्य विषयों पर सलाह करते रहेंगे लेकिन सलाह करते समय हम सभी अपनी पार्टी का ध्यान न रखकर देश और राष्ट्र का ध्यान रखें।

>SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Mr. Chairman, Sir, first of all I would like to congratulate Shri Jaswant Singh on his taking over the charge of the Ministry of External Affairs. Though it was very late, better late than never.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (ULUBERIA): It was you who proposed it.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : In a meeting of the Standing Committee on External Affairs, I voiced my concern about the absence of a Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs. When we discussed Pokhran-II, when we discussed here the foreign policy, I raised the question, `Why at this crucial juncture, India does not have a Foreign Minister?' Let me thank the Prime Minister for ultimately giving us a very competent Foreign Minister.

After having said this, I want to make a very important point. The Prime Minister of India had designated Shri Jaswant Singh, the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, to negotiate with the United States. President Bill Clinton on his part designated Mr. Talbott, Deputy Secretary of State, to negotiate with Shri Jaswant Singh. Today, Shri Jaswant Singh is no more Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission alone. Shri Jaswant Singh is the Foreign Minister of this biggest democracy in the world. I would expect that India would urge upon the United States to upgrade the level of dialogue. I would not like Shri Jaswant Singh carrying on talking to Mr. Talbott who is a Deputy Secretary of State. I would expect that the future negotiations between India and the United States will be between Shri Jaswant Singh and Mrs. Albright.

I have gone through the statement of the Prime Minister. The statement says that what had happened in May at Pokhran was in continuation of the policy adopted by the Government of India 25 years ago. I respectfully disagree with this. In fact, in the previous debates I had already pointed this out saying that the consistent policy of the Government of India after 1974 has been to reserve our options, to keep our option open whether to restrain ourselves or whether to go for a test.

1905 hours (Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

For 25 years, we have exercised our restraint. And, in May, the present Government decided to exercise that option to go for a Test. Therefore, it is not the same thing of the policy of the Congress Government and the successive other Governments to keep our options open. That is one difference.

The second difference, I had already pointed earlier, was that whenever there has been a new Test, it has been based on certain doctrines adopted by different countries. The 1974 option that we had exercised was very clearly on the doctrine of peaceful purposes, that we were doing it for peaceful purposes. But the present Government's option for a Test was not for peaceful purposes. It was for `from the point of view of security threat from the neighbouring countries.' In fact, in Prime Minister's letter to Bill Clinton, the countries were named, which is never in the area of diplomacy. And, therefore, for the Prime Minister to come to the Parliament and say that what has been done in continuation of the decision taken by the Government of India 24 years ago, I do not subscribe to this view.

What is the outcome of this? We all know that today India stand isolated in the commity of nations. Whether we like it or not, our country has come to be projected in the international community as a hegemonistic in its intent.

In the last debate, we have pointed out that the nuclear policy and our foreign policy of this country have been based on national consensus, and the decision of the Government of India to have gone for the second Test is a departure from that national consensus.

I had expected that after having committed the kind of a mistake, the Government would, at least, try to bring about a consensus on the strategy to explain the rationale of the Test to the international community. That is what I had expected. But that has not been there. We had a debate in this Parliament and the matter ended there. I have also been travelling in different parts of the world and I have also been in touch with Members of Parliament in different parts of the world; I have also been in touch with our diplomats in different parts of the world. The impression that I had gathered is that `we have not tried enough to explain our strategy.' It is high time that the Government thinks about it seriously.

I do not understand, where is the difficulty in Prime Minister calling the leaders of the Opposition and important political parties and take them into confidence, even on other issues, which I will be coming a little later. For example, on CTBT, what is the talk that is going on between Shri Jaswant Singh and Mr. Strobe Talbott?

The Prime Minister, in para 6 of the statement says that dialogue between Shri Jaswant Singh and Mr. Talbott was conducted on the basis of a set of comprehensive proposals put forward by India. These are proposals put by India. We do not know whether there are any other counter proposals from the United States of America. But the Prime Minister's statement says as follows :

"These are the proposals put forward by India and these proposals have been spelt out in the statement as including a voluntary moratorium on further tests, willingness to transform the voluntary moratorium into a de jure commitment, joining negotiations on a treaty for ban of future production of fissile material, implementing more stringent control over sensitive materials and technology."

What are the full implications of these proposals? We do not know. The country does not know about it. The full implications of these proposals have not been told to this country. The way these proposals have been put forward by India to the United States of America, to me it appears that you have become very apologetic for what we have done on May 11 and 13. You have become repentent and you say we are very sorry for what we have done. I said in the previous debate that the intention of the Government of India to have gone for a second test was to equate ourselves with the United States of America. If the United States of America and India are nuclear powers today, where is the question of India going to America and saying here are my proposals and we have done it and what can we do now and please have mercy on us? I think we are not talking from the position of strength. We must talk from the position of strength. I endorse the points which have been made by hon. lady Member Shrimati Krishna Bose. After what had happened a few days back to Iraq, I will not go into this. I will confine myself to say that India needs to be more cautious. India needs to be more assertive. Anyway, the talks are going on. Six rounds of discussions had already taken place. After six rounds of talks, the Prime Minister tells this nation that USA is turning around to see the viewpoint and concerns of India. Is there anything more in this or that is all? We would like to know some more details.

What is the position after the USA has turned around to see our viewpoint? The sanctions still continue. Two hundred Indian private and public companies are in the US' entities list. A large number of Indian organisations, public undertakings, scientific institutions, etc., have been included in this list. Even sub-contracting firms have been included in this list and these bodies are subjected to export restrictions. They will be subject to denial of trade, particularly in the matter of technology exports. Of course, I know the Government's stand of Swadeshi and self-reliance but I am afraid, the realities are different.

We are all aware that on the World Bank assistance to India, the United States Government has taken an official position which is discriminatory. What is that position? The USA has held a position that Pakistan deserved a more lenient treatment in the matter of World Bank Assistance than India did. This is the official position taken by the United States of America after six rounds of talks.

I will not speak for long. I straightway come to CTBT. In the earlier stages, after the Pokhran tests - I do not know about it but Shri Jaswant Singh will be able to reply - it was widely reported in the media that India might ultimately sign the CTBT on certain conditions. What are those conditions? It was reported widely in the media. I think, some of the Ministers have also made some utterances but I do not want to take their names. The number one condition was that the US should stop restrictions on use of dual use technology to India. The second condition was exemption of indigenously built reactors from international safeguards mechanism. The third condition was that there should be no curbs on future plans to deploy missiles or weaponise India's nuclear capabilities. I really do not know whether there can be any condition at all.

I was associated - directly or indirectly - with the Uruguay round of talks. I was directly or indirectly connected with negotiations on WTO. In fact, when the question of social clause came up, I was assigned a duty by the then Prime Minister Shri Narasimha Rao to mobilise public opinion around non-aligned and developing countries to oppose the introduction of the social clause. A meeting of the Labour Ministers was convened here and I had one week of sleepless nights during the negotiations. I am quite familiar with the subject. According to me, either you take it or leave it. We have reached a stage where there is the CTBT, whether we sign it or not. I do not know where the scope for putting any condition is.

I would like to know from the hon. Foreign Minister as to whether these parameters are there in his negotiations with Mr. Talbott. Nothing is clear from the statement of the Prime Minister which we are discussing today.

In fact, I do not like to go into the details. For example, restrictions on flow of dual use technology is in fact unrelated to CTBT and I do not know how it is put as one of the conditions. It is rather related to Non-Proliferation Treaty. On CTBT, my colleague and former Speaker, Shri Shivraj Patil has made our position very

clear. Our policy was spelt out at the Panchmarhi Convention. We had cautioned the Government not to be in a hurry. We have time to think over it and we have time to discuss about it. If he wishes so, perhaps Shri Jaswant Singh can take some of us into confidence, that is, some leaders of the political parties into confidence. Our only point is that they should not rush through.

FMCT is the second area. I, frankly speaking, could not make out much from the Prime Minister's statement on this. The statement is rather vague. Here again, I wish that the Government had taken some leaders of the political parties into confidence, at least on the parameters of the discussion unless he wants to keep it away from us as a secret.

>THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): I do not wish to interrupt you at all. I would like to say something here because this point has been raised three or four times. I do not wish to interrupt. In fact, in addition to Parliamentary debates, there had been three rounds of consultations with leaders of political parties held at the initiative of the Prime Minister in which leaders from the Congress Party were also present. They had expressed entire satisfaction with the details; the process and all other information were made available to them. The leaders included the Leader of the Opposition of this House and the other House as well. There were leaders from other parties as well. So, to suggest that no consultation had been made is perhaps not doing justice to the process that is started. Everyone was not consulted obviously, but leaders were certainly consulted.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Your coming into the Ministry is making a difference.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister has observed in his statement and I quote:

"The objective of FMCT negotiations at Geneva is ending of future production of fissile material for weapons purposes."

In this connection, I have a few questions to ask. How are we going to fulfil the superiority of fissile material stocks already secured by P-5 countries? Russia and the USA have stocks to produce 10,000 warheads. How are we going to fulfil the superiority? The second question that I would like to ask is what commitment will we agree to. The third question is what level and kind of verification of our fissile material capability production will we agree to. Will India be prepared to freeze the present asymmetries in fissile material stock holdings of various countries? Before you go to Geneva, I would expect the Government to tell this to Parliament.

I would like to make two more points. The Prime Minister's statement refers to dialogues which are going on with Germany, France, China, Russia and Japan. The names of these countries have been mentioned in the statement. But nothing has been mentioned about Pakistan. I would like to refer to China, since the Prime Minister has made a reference to China. Could the External Affairs Minister, in his reply, tell us as to what is the progress of dialogue between India and China? The country knows how our relationship had been strained and how the confidence building exercise between these two countries have been somehow negated by the Pokhran blasts. What are we doing to restore that confidence between India and China? How much progress has been made? I am happy that our relationship with Russia is growing and that the Prime Minister of Russia, Mr. Primakov, is here in India. I would like to thank the Government for whatever they are doing to strengthen the relationship with North-East India is trying to integrate its economy with the neighbouring countries, particularly with Bangladesh. It is only with this objective two agreements were arrived at, the SAPTA and the SAFTA. SAPTA is already in force and SAFTA would come into force by 2001 A.D. This is very very important for North-East. Have you taken up this matter with Pakistan? I would like to know whether Pakistan is going to sign SAFTA or not, particularly after the nuclear and SAFTA comes into operation by 2001?

Today we are not debating foreign policy. Today's discussion is limited to Indo-US relations. Our foreign policy is very important. When we were in the Youth Congress, we used to come to New Delhi for leadership training and seminar. It used to be addressed, among others, by Finance Ministers and the Foreign Minister. The Finance Minister used to tell us about the economic policies and the Foreign Minister used to explain the foreign policy. I remember, in one of the seminars, the then Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, telling us that the position of India in the comity of nations is so high that in any international conference, India need not speak.

It is not necessary that India should participate in the debate, speak out in the debate. The mere presence of India in the Conference Hall is enough. That is the stature of India. That was India. I do not know whether we are the same country. Why had we that kind of recognition from the world? I think because as far as the Foreign Policy was concerned, we used to take the national consensus. The whole world used to know that as far as India is concerned, they are unanimous on their Foreign Policy. Unfortunately, that is no more the case. It is very important. The whole world knew that India was the largest democracy in the world. It is not only the largest democracy, India has a functioning democracy, a stable democracy, an un-interrupted democracy. It is very important. India used to be respected. And, today we have to ask questions on this.

I am not addressing Shri Jaswant Singh or Shri Vajpayee led Government. I am addressing it to the whole House. The way our Parliament is functioning today, are we projecting to the whole world that we are a functioning democracy, a stable democracy? I think it is a very important question. It has a lot to do with our Foreign Policy. The whole world knew that we had national consensus on many and most of the national issues. The whole country would be one on matters which are of vital importance to this country. I do not know whether we are projecting that image today.

The Parliament is not able to function for days together because we are projecting ourselves as a country with differences, as if we have no consensus or unanimity in this country. It is weakening us. So, Shri Jaswant Singh's hands, who is not going to meet Mr. Talbott next time and who is going to meet Mrs. Albright, will be strengthened if we cooperate. I wish him best of luck and success not only in negotiations but also in his career as the Foreign Minister of this great country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister will reply to the debate tomorrow.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (BERHAMPORE) (WB): Sir, my name may be there. I know the hands of the clock are running faster.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We have no time left. We have to take up one more Bill also.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : This is an important subject. I belong to a small Party and nobody from my Party has spoken on this subject. I should express the opinion of my Party.

MR. SPEAKER: You should not worry. Though you belong to a small Party, you are a strong leader.

श्री हीरा लाल राय (छपरा): हमारी पार्टी आर.जे.डी. से किसी को नहीं बोलने दिया गया है, जबकि छोटी-छोटी पार्टियों के सदस्यों को बुलवाया जा रहा है।

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : I will conclude within five minutes' time.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I just wanted to have one clarification as to what time you wish me to answer the points tomorrow and how much further this discussion is to go on today. I am entirely in the hands of the House except that I have an obligation in the other House which is in a few minutes from now. I will certainly be guided by your directions and the wish of the House. Also, I could benefit with your direction as to what time tomorrow am I to give my reply tomorrow?

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : Sir, please give me five minutes or I will conclude within two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: You can speak not for five but two minutes.

>SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE : Sir, it is so nice of you.

Sir, I have heard many valuable speeches on this subject. I will not waste much of the time of this House. Sir, with your kind permission, I beg to refer to one question to which the Government had responded. That question was raised by Shri S.S. Owaisi on 10th March, 1997. The question was:

"Whether powerful US Congressmen have supported India's stand of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty?"

The answer was:

"The Government is aware of the support and stand taken by some US Congressmen on India's position on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty including Mr. Benjamin Gilman, Chairman of the International Relations Committee. There is a considerable understanding of India's position on the CTBT within the press and the academic community in the United States."

May I ask a very simple question from the Government? Is the Government aware of the full situation or has the Government taken stock of the situation of mutual understanding and the public sympathy in the United States of America in favour of India's Foreign Policy?

Sir, we have gone through the suo motu statement of the Prime Minister on the Indo-US bilateral dialogue and talks. In has a tradition of its own and India has a glorious heritage of its own. We are committed to peace and tranquillity. We are also committed to global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. But I am surprised to see what happened to the Government just after the nuclear test in Pokhran. What was the compulsion on the part of the Government to come forward and continue a dialogue with USA? Were they sanctions imposed upon India by America or any pressure mounted upon the head of the Government of India to sign the CTBT or was it a partial lifting of sanctions from India and Pakistan? What were the compelling circumstances which led the Government of India to continue Indo-US bilateral talks even after the nuclear tests in Pokhran?

Sir, India is still the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement. We know that after the disaster in Soviet Russia or after the disintegration of Russia, the bipolar world turned into a unipolar world yet the Non-Aligned Movement has its significance. As the leader of the Non-Aligned Movement, India has to play a significant role even today. But India has failed to do so. Today, we see that India is subservient to the dictates of American imperialism. That is why, the Government of India, out of threat perception, has begun to continue its dialogue with USA. This was not desirable. Just after the nuclear tests in Pokhran, the Government of India claimed to be a nuclear weapon State and it also claimed that that was a bold and the best step in respect of its national security and sovereignty. Where is that stand today?

Now I want to ask another question. Is it a fact that CTBT cannot be made operational without the concurrence of India? Sir, economy is the basis to interpret any policy. It may be internal policy or it may be foreign policy.

India is now a bankrupt country in respect of economic policy and internal policy. Yesterday, we had discussed on the Supplementary Demands for Grants. Today, the debt trap of the World Bank which has engulfed India is a death trap. We are caught in the debt trap. Indonesia is caught in the debt trap. Our former Prime Minister Shri I.K. Gujral has already explained that economic interpretation of the political situation and the foreign policy of the Government of India has made us to learn that this Government has failed. It is below the prestige of the Government of India to start afresh bilateral dialogue with USA. We have gained the consensus in respect of foreign policy. That is the glorious heritage of our country. We must not sign the CTBT. We must stand for ourselves, for our sovereignty and for our democracy.

>SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset, I extend my sincere thanks to hon. Shri Jaswant Singh for having assumed the post of the Foreign Minister. That was the consensus of the whole House earlier. I will be very brief. I will complete within two minutes. The subject matter before the House is the bilateral talks with the United States. The answer is yes. There should be bilateral talks. And decision out of discussion should be the spirit of talks.

I have gone through the statement of the Prime Minister. I will not enlarge my speech. Till today, six rounds of talks have taken place. It is mentioned in the statement that the problems are narrowed down. As a layman, I want to understand what were the problems, how have they been narrowed down or how have they bridged? Then it was mentioned in the statement that there will be a seventh round of talk in the middle of January wherein the topic will be CTBT and allied matters. In one sense, I can say that the very principle of the international relations and particularly the relations between a nation and a nation is very clearly spelt out by the foreign policy of India founded by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The glaring example of that is that the Prime Minister of the country Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, when he was the External Affairs Minister, had himself

advocated the case of the foreign policy. Within that framework, I will sum up in one sentence. We have to think about the problems which are supposed to be under discussion on the seventh round. I only feel that signing the CTBT should be logical and rational as if we could not project ourselves that we are eager to sign the CTBT. The pre-condition is that we are supposed to safeguard the interests of the national unity, integrity and sovereignty.

I have an apprehension that the statement is not self-explanatory, it is having some ambiguity. I do not want to point that out. I will just request the hon. Minister to clarify the position to the House as to what is what. It is rather difficult to say whether the Pokhran test is justified or not.

I do not want to enter into that controversy. But what we exhibit is rebounded by Pakistan. That is also a thing of great concern. At least, we may have restraint. Any responsible Minister sitting there must think that we will have a venue, date and time to extend the invitation to Pakistan. Somebody has uttered the same thing regarding China.

MR. SPEAKER: Again, it is a repetition of what has already been said.

SHRI R.S. GAVAI (AMRAVATI): Lastly, I would like to tell that it is a matter of great concern that the sanctions imposed by America are not yet spelt out. The eventuality has come to us to face. Considering the devaluation of the rupee, what will be the financial implications on the country? We are supposed to examine that aspect. By and large, in a good spirit, I extend my support subject to the condition that the hon. Minister should make a safe explanatory statement in the reply.

>PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (BARAMULLA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if Shri Jaswant Singh is not going to be here, I have no need of speaking. My Party has got only four or five minutes. But I will speak when the hon. Foreign Minister is here...(Interruptions) If he has to leave, if it is a routine thing for him, then, I do not speak. My point is the smaller parties suffer at the fag end. This is a House that wastes two hours for the Zero Hour. I am not going to repeat a single word. But I have something to say...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Prof. Soz, the Minister of State is already here.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : No. Sir, I have greeted Shri Jaswant Singh because we are relieved today that there is a Foreign Minister. We have suffered for nine months. So, I want only five minutes to speak. But the hon. Minister Shri Jaswant Singh has to be here. If he is not here, I will not speak. I withdraw...(Interruptions) As I said earlier, I will not repeat a single word. But I have a hurt feeling that we have to come at the fag end of the Session and speak for four minutes only. I have something to say.

First thing is that I am very much relieved that Shri Jaswant Singh has taken his position very deservedly. We are very happy that we are very safe. I must support Shri Sangma about one thing. I was one of those who raised the question here that the Foreign Minister should not speak to Mr. Talbott because our Foreign Minister represents this great nation. But now I support Shri Sangma when he said that Shri Jaswant Singh should speak only to the Foreign Minister of the United States of America Ms. Madeleine Albright.

Since I said that I will not repeat, I will not speak anything about the CTBT. I feel that the Government will have good sense to consult people around and take a good and correct decision for the nation. Of that, I am sure. But, from time to time, it must become a routine thing and it must be institutionalized in the system that the opposition leaders must be consulted. Sometimes, smaller parties are there. You cannot force us to join bigger

parties. The future is for the coalition. I say it. Therefore, I request you to give us time to express our ideas.

The Prime Minister's statement on the Gulf was inadequate, in my opinion. I do not say it because of Iraq. Iraq has stood with us in the past on Kashmir. Iraq is a different country, a special country for India. Iraq always stood with us on Kashmir. When I said that it was inadequate, I did not say it because of Iraq only. I say it because we are a big country and a big nation. Therefore, it must be adequate with the nation's dignity. I want the Prime Minister to condemn it. I say it primarily because the whole world is watching India. India is emerging

into a very big situation for the whole world. I have no anxiety in my mind if today we are not in the Security Council. India cannot be refused that position. India will win that position. But where I feel very much anxious and very much worried is that India is not performing any role this time for ushering in a situation of multipolarity.

I want to remind the hon. Minister Shri Jaswant Singh that when Baghdad was attacked by America last time in 1991, many Indians including myself wanted Russia to show a fist although that fist was empty because Russia was in difficulty at that time. People like me think that it is not because of the Armed Forces that nations can act and react on the globe. There are so many other things like the cultural factor, the regional factors, the strategic factors and the ideologies. So, now a multipolar world is emerging. India should decide about it. Shri Jaswant Singh is equal to the task. We are happy about it. India must decide to contribute and not wait for Mr. Primakov to come and tell us that we are going to usher in a multipolar world.

India must take the lead. I am one with them today on the Bomb. I was against it at that time. Even today, I can say, I have travelled internationally a lot, Jawaharlal Nehru's name and Mahatma Gandhi's name is much more powerful as compared to Pokhran. But, today I take a position with the B.J.P., the Congress, and with the whole House that we have not committed any crime. We are a sovereign nation and we had done the tests. It is all right. But we are not doing anything as far as ushering in a multi-polar world is concerned. India must give the lead.

But since there is no time, I will not bring in Russia. I have greeted the Russian Prime Minister because I felt that when there was a crisis in Gulf, when they recalled their Ambassadors from two countries, why should the Russian Prime Minister rush here? It is because Russia considers India important; China considers India important. I have not been happy with some statements made about China earlier by some people. I am not an expert about China. But, I would like to say that in Kyoto, in 1997, while I led my country on environment, in the first meeting with my counterpart from China, I could feel that China on the question of climate change, wanted to come closer. But it was a difficult decision. I consulted my officials, then I consulted myself. I felt as a Cabinet Minister at Kyoto, where Japan and Britain were holding brief for the U.S. that. US was wrong in asking China or India to accept responsibility U.S. was the largest polluter of the world. With five per cent of the population, the U.S. is emitting emission into the atmosphere to the tune of 25 per cent of the entire emissions in the world. Yet, the U.S. at that time wanted to pressurize China, wanted to pressurize India and through us, the G-77. But I found in my first meeting that our counterpart from China was willing to cooperate with me and then after consultations, China and India went together. We came closer and we defeated the U.S. designs at that time. It was a very big issue. Environment is now globally very important. I want to say, if China and India could come closer, on environment they can do so in other issue also. Even in Buenos Aires this time, America agreed to cut back emissions by five per cent on 1990 level, it is not because of discussions there but it is because China and India came closer on this issue. Shri Gujral said that he does not want a Russia-India-China Bloc and he is not interested in a Bloc. But we are interested in a very close friendship with China. We have heard so many statements. I have convinced myself, as a citizen of this country that we can improve relations with China. China is as much eager to forge relations with India. Therefore, tomorrow, when you reply to this debate in this House, you kindly tell us something about the Sino-Indian relations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair wants the sense of the House to take up the reply by the Minister tomorrow immediately after the Question Hour. Does the House agree?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

>SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Yesterday, I sat till 1900 hours on the discussion on floods. My name was there but I could not speak. After sitting for three hours, I went. Today, I was told that my name was there. Sir, do you mean to say that the discussion is meant only for the senior Members? Do you think that we, junior Members and new Members like me, do not have anything significant to contribute? Tell us, Sir. Then, we will not sit or say anything.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no objection in giving time. But, we have to pass two Bills.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN: Already injustice is being done to new Members like me.

MR. SPEAKER: No. You have to understand the position also. We have one or two Bills to be passed today itself.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : We sit here for hours together. We read volumes of papers. Then, you say that you do not have any time for us. I express my frustration before you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Swain, you can speak for two minutes.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, our hon. Prime Minister and the Government has avowed intentions that India needs a nuclear weapon-free world. India wants disarmament; India wants non-proliferation. Sir, I mean to say, are we not the only country having nuclear weapons but arguing for the total elimination of the nuclear arsenal?

No other nuclear weapons State does so. Are we not the only country who have made a de facto declaration of the intention of `no first use' and `no use against non-nuclear weapons States'? We want to make it a de jure obligation. Is it not a fact that no nuclear or fissile material technology was transferred to any third country from India in the past? Does it not prove the reliability of India that India does what it says? I can tell you that other nuclear weapons States like America, England, Russia and China have transferred this technology to other countries. Now, they say that there are some rogue States in the world like Iraq, Iran, Sudan and Libya. From whom have they received this technology? These rogue States have received it from America, Russia, England and other countries who are having this nuclear weapons technology.

Sir, our national security is not negotiable. Nobody can dictate us as to what security measures we can take. I would like to say that we should have a credible nuclear deterrent for our security. Then, the Government should develop a reliable delivery system and create an elaborate nuclear command, control and communication chain.

Sir, while initiating this debate, Shri Rupchand Pal has said that we do not require nuclear bomb. It is very surprising. When China exploded nuclear bomb in the early 1960s, the same Leftists went gaga over it and said that it was a `workers' bomb' and now they say that it is not required. When China did it, it was very good, but when India did it, it is very bad. They also say that we have been isolated. Has NAM isolated us? Have we been isolated us? The Prime Minister of Russia, which is having nuclear weapons, has come to our country now.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : Sir, I will conclude within a minute.

So, we have not been isolated. Then, they say that sanctions have been imposed on us. I would like to tell that it is rather America which has been isolated in imposing sanctions against us. Which other country has imposed sanctions against us? It is only America which has imposed sanctions against us. The United States of America asked other countries to impose sanctions against us, but nobody did it and, so, we are not isolated.

Sir, they say that we do not require weaponisation. Unless we weaponise, what is the need of testing it? We tested it in 1974, but it was not proven that it was beneficial to us in any way, because we did not weaponise then.

Sir, when Shri Sangma spoke, he found fault with the Government for everything. He said that we are hegemonistic. But like America, have we attacked Iraq? Have we attacked Bangladesh? Have we attacked Pakistan? We are not hegemonistic. He also said that the rationale behind the nuclear tests has not been explained. What rationale does he require? The rationale is that we want to have a credible nuclear deterrent for our national security. Does he not find it a strong rationale?

Sir, the Leftists always go on criticising America and they find fault with America on every issue. It is just like giving the dog a bad name and killing it. America is not our enemy. America may be a dada, America may be a bully, but it is one of the biggest democracies in the world and we must have communication with it. It is not against us.

Finally, I would like to say that our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, is the chosen man to lead India to victory and bring `Param Vaibhav' to India. I would also like to say that he would take India from darkness to light, from indignity to dignity and he would make India the best country in the 21st Century. So, I congratulate him for what he did.

With these words, I conclude my speech.